VOLUME V NUMBER 1

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JANUARY 1931

EDITORIAL

CONSIDERABLE INTEREST AND FAVORABLE COMMENT HAS BEEN occasioned by the first instalment of John Horsch's article on the "Faith of the Swiss Brethren". Not only does the author present a comprehensive analysis of the doctrines held by these simple Swiss Christians of four centuries ago, but he also takes pains to consider and refute various misconceptions of the teachings of the group which have been held or are still held. The extensive documentation shows that the work is soundly based on the original sources.

The first instalment, after dealing with introductory questions, took up the "Doctrine of the Scriptures". The second instalment, in this issue, concludes this discussion and adds the section on the "Doctrine of the Trinity". The result of the study in both points is the disclosure that the Swiss Brethren were consistent biblicists, evangelical, soundly moderate and practical, free from fanaticism or doctrinal aberrations.

POPULAR JUDGMENT ABOUT THE BOLSHEVIST EXPERIMENT IN Russia, particularly in America, concerns itself chiefly with the practical working of the communist system as it has been set up. Will it succeed in industrializing Russia on the vast scale it proposes, will collective farming increase the output of agricultural products, is the motive which fires the breast of the communist party worker strong enough to hold him to the program? Such are the questions which are asked. In these modern days when economic

questions seem so prominent, there is no doubt reason for this attitude. But it dare not be forgotten that at base, Russian Bolshevism is founded on a philosophy, a faith, a conception of man and of the world, which furnishes the real foundation for the entire social and economic program that is now being carried on. It is the service of Professor Benjamin Unruh's second article on "The Flight of the Mennonites from Russia" to lay bare this basic philosophy which drives the Bolshevist on. He points out that modern Russian Bolshevism is the consequent flowering of orthodox Marxism with its materialistic philosophy of history and its summons to the creation of the millennial social order of the proletariat. He further points out that the anti-religious bias of the movement is basic, and that the conflict with Christianity is inevitable.

After analyzing the essential character of bolshevist philosophy, Professor Unruh concludes by describing the practical measures used by the authorities to carry out the anti-Christian phase of their program. It thus becomes clear that the flight of the Mennonites from Russia was due not only to the economic spoliation which they suffered, but still more to the inescapable conflict with the bolshevist program in which they found themselves, due to the antithesis of their faith and its philosophy. This basic antithesis, according to Professor Unruh, justifies the flight, since they were bound to lose in the unequal struggle with the relentless atheistic state machine.

The field of American Mennonite history between the Revolutionary War and the Civil War is largely untraveled terrain. Sources for the period are meager, and the writing of American Mennonite history was not begun until a much later date. Bishop Benjamin Eby's *Kurzgefasste Kirchengeschichte* of 1841 is the sole exception. It is with pleasure therefore that the editors are able to present translations of a considerable correspondence between a Mennonite of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and his relatives in the Rhenish Palatinate, Germany, covering the years 1807—1839. The writer of the letters, Martin Mellinger, was a prominent deacon, a man of vigorous personality, active interests, and sincere piety. His letters, meagre though they are in important historical material, are nevertheless fresh and interesting documents of their time, which contribute to our understanding of the Mennonites of eastern Pennsylvania in that age a century ago. Especially interesting are the glimpses of Peter Eby, the outstanding leader of Lancaster County Mennonitism in his day.

Other unpublished documents of early American Mennonitism of even greater value than the Mellinger correspondence are in the editorial files of the REVIEW awaiting publication. They will appear at as early a date as possible.

WITH THIS ISSUE, THE INITIAL NUMBER OF VOLUME V, THE REview introduces a new department, "The Survey." Due to limitations of space, the new department will not be fully presented in this issue. "The Survey" is designed to furnish, first, a comprehensive summary of all the significant current published material on Mennonite history, thought and life, and second a digest of significant current news of historical interest. It will be divided into two departments: "Survey of Mennonite Periodicals" and "Research Notes." In the department called "Survey of Mennonite Periodicals," a digest of significant articles in the thirty-five or more current Mennonite periodicals published throughout the world, will be presented. Where the value of the articles warrants it, an abstract will be included. The editors believe that this department will be of unusual value since it will make it possible for readers to keep constantly informed on Mennonite thought throughout the world insofar as this is expressed in periodical literature. This department will also include brief book notices for publications where a more extended review is not warranted. Due to lack of space this department will not be inaugurated until the second issue in the year 1931.

The department entitled "Research Notes" will report on all current research material bearing on Mennonite history, sociology, and general interests. The entire field of historical periodicals will be covered, and the essential information will be reproduced. Occasionally this will necessitate "Notes" of some length. As far as possible this department will report on all dissertations and theses bearing on Mennonite history, as they are issued. Research projects will be described, and activities of historical societies reported. Historical news of significance will also be included.

The editors believe that the introduction of this new feature will mark a distinct increase in the service which the REVIEW renders to its readers. They hope to continue the same standard in this new departure which has been maintained in the regular material presented. Contributions from readers will be welcomed and are solicited. It should be possible in this fashion to keep all those interested in Mennonite history and current thought abreast of significant contributions wherever found. Thus the MENNONITE

QUARTERLY REVIEW will more adequately fulfil its function as a "review".

It is well known that non-popular periodicals are frequently published at a loss, and require a subsidy to maintain themselves. THE REVIEW is a periodical of this type. It has been published at a loss from the start, and can continue to exist only because of a modest subsidy. The publishers have maintained the unusually low price of one dollar in order to secure as wide a distribution of the journal as possible, reckoning that a wider distribution would serve to establish it more effectively. They have now come to the point where they feel it necessary to increase the subscription list considerably or increase the subscription price. There has been a gratifying increase in the number of paid subscriptions during the past year, the number having more than doubled. An intensive effort is now being made to secure a further increase. With the new feature announced in this issue, the editors feel that THE REVIEW now more than ever deserves and will have the support of its increasing circle of readers and friends.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

JOHN HORSCH: Mennonite Historian and Author, Scottdale, Pennsylvania.

BENJAMIN H. UNRUH: Formerly Professor in the Mennonite College at Halbstadt, Russia, now Professor in the Technical University at Karlsruhe, Germany, and European agent of the Mennonites of Russia.

HAROLD S. BENDER: Professor of Church History, Goshen College.

ERNST CORRELL: Professor in the Graduate School of the American University, Washington, D. C.

GUY F. HERSHBERGER: Professor of History, Goshen College.

JOHN UMBLE: Professor of English, Goshen College.

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS ISSUE

M. E. CURTI—*The American Peace Crusade.* Reviewed by G. F. Hershberger.

E. L. MEYER—*Hey! Yellowbacks.* Reviewed by G. F. Hershberger.

PAUL KOCH—*Der Einfluss des Calvinismus und des Mennonitentums auf die Niederrheinische Textilindustrie.* Reviewed by Ernst Correll.

JOHN HORSCH—*The Hutterian Brethren—A Story of Martyrdom and Loyalty.* Advance notice by Ernst Correll.

ELLA ZOOK—*Fifty Bible Stories.* Reviewed by John Umble.

OSCAR BURKHOLDER—*True Life Stories.* Reviewed by John Umble.

THE FAITH OF THE SWISS BRETHREN

II

JOHN HORSCH

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES

(Continued)

After the debate of October, 1523, Zwingli adopted the view that the best interests of the church demanded his consent to the union of church and state on which the civil authorities insisted. He held that opposition to such a union, though in possible agreement with Scripture, was jeopardizing the welfare of the church and therefore irreconcilable with Christian love. In consequence he modified his former teaching in various respects. In his public debates with the Brethren he discussed with them infant baptism only. Formerly he had looked upon infant baptism with disfavor, as he expressly states in his *Book on Baptism.*[82] He realized however that for a state church, such as the Council had decided to establish, the baptism of infants was indispensable. In consequence, he became an ardent defender of this practice. The Reformed Church historian J. M. Usteri, in a treatise on *Zwingli's Doctrine of Baptism,* says with reference to this change in his doctrinal position: "The impulses which led him in this instance were not the results of theological thinking but had their origin in the consideration of the needs of the church."[83] It was therefore but natural that his arguments from Scripture for infant baptism, the union of church and state, the omission of discipline, etc., were not convincing. This fact is now recognized by many historians of the Reformed Church.[84]

---

82 *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. IV, Leipzig, 1927, p. 228. Zwingli's earlier position on these points will be duly considered in other connections.

83 Usteri, J. M., *Darstellung der Tauflehre Zwinglis,* in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Gotha, 1882, p. 212.

84 Usteri says: "The endeavor to prove infant baptism as altogether scriptural misled Zwingli to various acts of exegetical violence." (Usteri, in article mentioned above, p. 283, cf., *ibid.,* p. 263). "It is now almost unanimously admitted that in this controversy the opponents of infant baptism were only apparently silenced, not refuted," says Professor Friedrich Nippold; "both Zwingli and Luther saw themselves compelled, in view of the objections of the Anabaptists, to modify their

Zwingli's new attitude on the question of the authority of Scripture, in which the Brethren could not follow him, is well illustrated by his position on the question of church discipline. He and his co-workers admitted that church discipline, including excommunication, is taught and commanded in Scripture. After the Protestant state church was established and Scriptural discipline was found impracticable, he defended the opinion that under the prevailing circumstances the practice of discipline was contrary to the best interests of the church. Therefore he assumed that the Brethren, by insisting on the need of discipline as taught in Scripture, sinned against Christian love. Both in the debates of Zofingen (1532)[85] and Bern (1538)[86] such assertions were made by the state church theologians in the discussions on church discipline.

In the debate of Zofingen the representatives of the state church made the proposition that in these discussions love, instead of the letter of Scripture, should be the final judge in the controverted points. They said further: "In anything that meets an existing need and serves the purposes of Christian love, love should be the criterion, and the letter [of Scripture] should be subjected to it."[87] Expressed in plain English this meant that even though any view of the Brethren was found to be in accordance with the Scriptures, they were nevertheless under obligation to yield the

---

original position whose implications clearly favored the view of the Anabaptists." (Nippold, F., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Schweizerischen Reformations-Kirchen,* Bern 1884, p. 440). Professor Walther Köhler, one of the editors of the new edition of Zwingli's Works, says: "In the last analysis Zwingli could maintain infant baptism only as a concession to human weakness and historical development." (*Zwinglis Werke,* Band II, p. 364). Professor Johann Loserth says: "On the basis of his own premises Zwingli was now opposed by his former associates, and only by carrying the conflict over into the political field was he able to hold his own." (Loserth, J., *Wiedertäufer in Steiermark,* in Mitteilungen des historischen Vereins für Steiermark," 1884, p. 119). Cf. also Eissenlöffel, *Franz Kolb,* p. 59.

[85] *Handlung oder Acta gehaltener Disputation und Gespräch zu Zoffingen in Berner Biet mit den Widertöuffern,* Bern 1532, fol. 70a, 72a.

[86] *Acta Des gesprächs zwüschen predicantenn Vnnd Touffbrüderenn Ergangen, Inn der Statt Bernn vom* XI *Mertzenns biss vf den* XVII *Desselben Monats im M. D. XXXVIII Jar.* The records of this great debate have never been published and indeed apparently never before been used by any one of the writers on the history of the Swiss Brethren. The records are in the state archives of Bern and are bound together with other documents in volume 80 of "Unnütze Papiere" (worthless papers). The Mennonite Historical Library in Scottdale, Pa., has a certified copy, made by Dr. Adolf Fluri, of Bern.

[87] *Zofingen,* fol. 72a ff. The Reformed church historian Oscar Farner says of the Swiss Brethren: "They had in fact the letter of the Scriptures on their side, and neither scorn nor the use of force could prevail against them." (*Huldrych Zwingli, der Schweizerische Reformator,* Emmishofen, p. 32).

point. On the other hand, the state church was not under obligation of yielding though the Brethren's view on a given point was founded on Scripture. Yielding for the sake of love on the part of the state church was out of the question. In fact, the civil authorities would not have permitted it. One of the spokesmen of the state church in this debate addressed the Brethren: "We are of one mind in the leading articles of faith, and our controversy is only about articles that have to do with external things;"[88] he held that from motives of love they should yield in these things even if they had the teaching of Scripture on their side. The Brethren, on the other hand, pointed out that the existing differences in faith, principles and practice were fundamental and vital. The state church system made the practice of certain New Testament commands impossible; it made the church virtually a department of the state and involved the utterly unchristian cruel persecution of the dissenters. Yielding in external things was yielding everything.

The Brethren freely admitted, as indicated above, that it is possible to have the letter without the spirit; nevertheless they asserted that the plain teaching of the Word can not be set aside on the plea that to heed it is contrary to love. One of their spokesmen in the disputation of Bern, in 1538, asked the question: "Is that which Christ has spoken the dead letter?"[89] Pilgram Marbeck pointed out that according to Christ's own statement His words are "spirit and life" (John 6:63). He showed that the words of Paul, "The letter killeth", (II Cor. 3:6) "do not refer to evangelical Scriptural preaching of New Testament truth", but that the apostle speaks here "of the letter of the Law which had the purpose to kill."[90] The Brethren insisted that such a love which causes men to

---

88 *Zofingen,* fol. 27 b.

89 *Acta des Gesprächs,* p. 276. To this question the spokesman of the state church replied: "As you understand and use it (speaking of church discipline) it is the dead letter." He made this assertion for the reason that scriptural discipline was impossible in the state church, and to insist on practising it was supposed to be contrary to love. And yet somewhat later a state church spokesman expressed regret that Scriptural discipline was impracticable in the national church. He said: "Would to God that we among our people could practice discipline according to the letter of Scripture and the best method, but at the present time it cannot be done." (*Ibid.,* p. 278).

90 Marbeck, *Antwort,* p. 319. Pilgram Marbeck was the most prominent minister of a group of evangelical "Anabaptist" churches located at Strasburg in Alsace, Augsburg in Swabia, and other places, which in doctrine and practice were wellnigh identical to the Swiss Brethren. One of his books was reprinted by Christian Hege in the *Gedenkschrift* already mentioned (pp. 178-282), while his comprehensive reply to Kaspar Schwenckfeld, who had written a refutation of the first-mentioned book, was recently published by Johann Loserth (*Pilgram Marbecks Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches von der Bundesbezeugung von* 1542. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der oberdeut-

ignore God's Word is not Christian love. In the discussions held at Zofingen they said:

> It is necessary to make a distinction in regard to love. We speak of the love to which John refers in his epistles and Gospel: This is the love of God that we keep His commandments.[91]
>
> There are obviously two kinds of love, one carnal and the other spiritual.[92]
>
> To seek the praise of God and the love toward one's neighbor is to cling to the Word of the Lord and be conformed to it. This is spiritual love. . . . This love shall prevail in the church of God.[93]

Johannes Oecolampad, of Basel, the most prominent and influential co-worker with Zwingli in Switzerland, often used the same argument in his discussions with the Brethren. After reading Hubmaier's book on *The Christian Baptism of Believers,* (which, as the Zwinglian theologian J. M. Usteri states, established the fact that there is no direct Scripture to justify infant baptism),[94] Oecolampad sent this book to Zwingli on October 2, 1525, and at the same time wrote him a letter in which he says: "It seems to me the Anabaptists have no regard for Christian love, which shows us what is to be observed of external things."[95] In August, 1527, he further wrote to Zwingli that he had never dared and did not now venture to base infant baptism on a direct divine command, but for the sake of Christian love it was necessary to maintain and practice it. In his discussions with the Swiss Brethren Oecolampad repeatedly accused them of sinning against Christian love by their refusal to identify themselves with the state church. "We have taught," he says, "that to discard infant baptism is out of place, being contrary to Christian love." And again: "Your doctrine is in direct opposition to true love."[96] One of his books against the Swiss Brethren

---

schen Taufgesinnten im 16. Jahrhundert, Wien und Leipzig, 1929). The sketch of Marbeck's life printed in this work is to be supplemented by material found in Roth, F., *Augsburg's Reformationsgeschichte,* vol. III, München, 1907, p. 279, which shows that Marbeck died in 1556.

91 *Zofingen,* p. 6a.

92 *Ibid.,* p. 8a.

93 *Ibid.,* p. 67a. Similar statements on pp. 8b, 6b.

94 *Usteri,* p. 263.

95 *Zwinglis Werke,* vol. VIII, p. 375. The book of Hubmaier just mentioned has on the title page the motto, "Love rejoiceth in the truth."

96 *Ain Gespräch etlicher Predicanten zu Basel mit etlichen Bekennern des Widertauffs,* 1525, fol. A2b and B5b. Cf. Hagenbach, K. R., *Johann Oekolampad und Oswald Myconius, die Reformatoren Basels,* Elberfeld 1859, p. 116. The first named book was reprinted in *Sammlung alter und neuer Urkunden zur Beleuchtung der Kirchen-Geschichte vornehmlich des Schweizer-Landes* von J. J. Simler, vol. I, part 2, pp. 494-514.

has a chapter bearing the title: "The Abandonment of Infant Baptism Is Contrary to Christian Love."[97]

Small wonder that the Brethren could not see that love should cause them to yield their position and make common cause with the state church. At the time when Oecolampad wrote these sentences the state church of Basel, in which he held a prominent place, was yet the Roman Catholic Church. He was at that time a Zwinglian by profession. For years the Council of Basel permitted him and others to preach Zwinglian doctrine, but not to introduce Zwinglian worship and practice. Although in his *Exposition of the First Epistle of John,* published in 1524, and in other places, he had said that the mass is an abomination and blasphemy against God,[98] he nevertheless continued to hold the office of priest. He and most of the other priests of the city who preached Zwinglian doctrine were obliged to say mass daily. Since they would not lay down their office in the state church, they saw themselves compelled to engage in that which they denounced as blasphemous. Oecolampad declared his willingness to say mass and make no changes in worship and practice without the consent of the authorities.[99] Not only the Swiss Brethren but also some of his friends in the state church considered it a grave offense that he consented to do that which according to his own teaching was idolatrous.[100]

---

97 Oecolampad, J., *Antwort auff Balthasar Hubmeiers büchlein wider der Predicanten gespräch zu Basel von dem kindertauff,* Basel 1527, sig. K4, cf. sig. N5. Martin Butzer, the reformer of Strassburg, in his controversy with the Swiss Brethren, used the same argument. Cf. Lang, A., *Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers und die Grundzüge seiner Theologie,* Leipzig 1900, p. 130; Gerbert, C., *Geschichte der Strassburger Sectenbewegung zur Zeit der Reformation,* Strassburg, 1880, p. 100. Balthasar Hubmaier, in his reply to a book of Oecolampad, answers the argument that believers' baptism is contrary to Christian love as follows: "If the Scriptures teach that baptism has been instituted for the instructed and the believers, and not for infants, then this is the truth. Now Paul writes that love rejoiceth in the truth, I Cor. 13. What, is now the truth contrary to love? But perhaps you speak of the love of the world which may not endure divine truth, for its works are evil, therefore it hates the light, John 3." (*Von dem khindertauff,* Nicolspurg, 1527).

98 Oecolampad, J., *In Epistolam Ioannis Apostoli Catholicam primam....Demegoriae,* Basel, 1524, fol. 66b.

99 Hagenbach, K. R., *Johann Oekolampad und Oswald Myconius,* Elberfeld, 1859, pp. 64 and 210. A few weeks before Easter of the year 1526 the Council of Basel exempted Oecolampad from the obligation to say mass on the excuse that he was occupied with other necessary work. (Herzog, J. J., *Das Leben Oecolampads und die Reformation der Kirche zu Basel,* vol. I, Basel, 1834, p. 353 ff).

100 *Ibid.,* p. 200. In the principal stronghold of the Brethren in Switzerland, namely the Emmenthal (valley of the Emme) in the canton Bern, the mass was abolished before the government of the canton gave permission for this reform. When thereupon the local authorities of Langnau (the commercial and social center of the district) were ordered to re-instate the mass, they addressed the authorities in Bern in a petition dated October 28, 1527. They called attention to

In a letter dated February 6, 1525, to William Farel, Oecolampad stated that he had advised Jacob Immler, one of the priests, who also preached Zwinglian doctrine to "make a public deception" by saying mass in appearance only, omitting the words which are the most essential part of mass, and substituting some other words.[101] Mass being said in Latin, possibly the deception would not be noticed. But this stratagem did not remove the offence. In 1530 Oecolampad stated that if it was permissible to go to mass, it was also unobjectionable to sacrifice at the altars of the heathen deities Jupiter and Venus.[102] However before the Council of Basel permitted the abolition of mass, he held that the insistence of the Swiss Brethren on discarding the mass was contrary to Christian love since in his view it did not serve the best interests of the church.[103]

In 1527 Oecolampad addressed the Swiss Brethren:

> I know full well that you cry, Scripture, Scripture, asking us for clear words to prove our teaching, and that you say, the

---

the strict mandate of the "lords" of the canton ordering all priests to preach only what can be substantiated by Scripture. They stated further that in obedience to this mandate their priest had taught the Scriptural view of the mass, namely that it is idolatry. Then soon some of the people who objected to saying mass, addressed the local authorities in this manner: "If you and the priest know that mass is idolatry, why does he continue to say mass and practice such idolatry, and why do you permit it?" On the ground of the mandate demanding that God's Word must be taught, the petitioners had decided to abolish mass, since, as they said, "the kingdom of God does not consist in words only but in deeds." They added that they only carried the preached Word into practice, and that their priest offered at every turn to give answer to any one from Scripture concerning each and every doctrinal point. They begged most humbly for permission to abstain from the further practice of the mass, and that the priest should not be banished. The "lords" finally decided to grant their petition pending further orders. In a few places of the district also the mass was discarded before its abolishment by the authorities of the canton. (*Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Berner Reformation,* 1521-1532, herausgegeben on Steck and Tobler, Bern, 1923, p. 512 f; cf. Müller, *Geschichte der Bernischen Täufer,* p. 22 f).

101 Herminjard, A. L., *Correspondence des Reformateurs,* vol. I, Geneva, 1878, p. 335. Oecolampad added that Immler had scruples against following this advice. To encourage him and help him overcome them, he promised him to be present personally at his next mass service. However, Immler's conscience finally gained the victory. He laid down his office and became a weaver.

102 Herzog, *Leben Oecolampads,* vol. I, p. 242. At an earlier time, namely in 1522, Oecolampad as chaplain in Ebernburg castle, under the protection of Franz von Sikkingen, ventured to say mass in the German language. When a friend protested against this innovation as endangering unity and love, Oecolampad's reply was that a needed reform cannot be contrary to love but should only serve to establish love. *Ibid.,* vol. I, p. 105. After the period of Oecolampad's controversy with the Swiss Brethren, namely on May 12, 1528, when some one asserted that the abolition of the mass at Constance was contrary to Christian love, he wrote to Johann Zwick, the reformer of that city, that this assertion was quite out of place.

103 On Zwingli's attitude on this question cf. Schiess, *Briefwechsel,* vol. I, p. 147.

> words of Scripture which would give such proof are like the nightbirds, they will not come to the light of day. But if Scripture would teach all points there would be no need for the anointing to teach us concerning all things.[104]

Zwingli himself, as already intimated, advanced the argument that the Brethren's dissent from the state church was due to a lack of love, rather than deviation from Scripture. He declared that the Brethren dissented from the national church "because of mere external things." In his *Commentarius* he says: "But that no one may suppose that we differ on doctrines which concern the inner man, let it be said that they cause us difficulty only on account of questions such as these, whether infants or adults should be baptized and whether a Christian may be a magistrate . . . . Even if they had Scripture to support their views, these things should be decided by love."[105] Zwingli overlooked the fact that their withdrawal from his leadership was due to his own deviation from his former position, and if love could heal the breach and cause one of the parties to yield, his love should be the first to come into consideration. Love was entirely lost sight of by Zwingli in giving his consent to the persecution of the Brethren.

We have an important statement by Michael Sattler on the relation of Christian love toward obedience to the biblical commandments. During Sattler's sojourn in Strasburg Martin Butzer tried to convince him that the Brethren erred not so much in faith as in love, since they refused to surrender the points of difference and to unite with the state church. In consequence, Sattler wrote to Butzer and his co-workers a letter in which he says:

> Recently I have conferred with you in a brotherly way and friendliness concerning certain articles which I and my brethren and sisters have learned from the Scriptures of the New Testament. But you have answered me in the same manner and friendliness that Paul says, I Tim. 1:15, that "love is an end of the commandment" and you said that it is therefore necessary that all commandments of God should be treated and interpreted in accordance with love. Now, my understanding and conscience forbid me to accept your interpretation of this Scripture. I can not consent to your view and usage in regard to baptism, the Lord's Supper, the use of force and the sword, the oath, church discipline, and all the commandments of God . . . . These and many other things are in my way, dear brethren, and I cannot accept your interpretation and application of the principle stated by Paul in the verse quoted above [finding myself unable to

---

104 Oecolampad, *Antwort*, sig. J3.
105 *Zwinglis Werke*, vol. III, p. 872.

believe that Paul taught that the clear divine teachings and commands may be set aside for the sake of love].[106]

The idea that love should cause the Swiss Brethren to yield the points in which they differed from the state church leaders, while the latter were under no obligation of yielding, is in the last analysis similar to the principle of "the sparing of the weak" which was defended by the foremost leaders of state church Protestantism before the civil rulers permitted the introduction of practical reforms. This principle meant that out of love for the weak, i. e., out of regard for those who were, or pretended to be, offended by the abolition of the mass, the observance of the mass should be further continued, though it was believed to be idolatrous and blasphemous. But such an attitude on this question meant that vital religious principles were trifled with. True, the reformers advised the priests to use deception and say mass "in appearance only," but the offence was none the less, since "the weak" were left under the impression that the ministers did that which they believed to be an abomination before God, and even the more considerate among those who supported the reformation movement must have been offended and discouraged by such an attitude of obvious compromise.[107] Thus for the sake of expediency the authority of

---

106 Röhrich, T. W., *Zur Geschichte der strassburgischen Wiedertäufer in den Jahren* 1527 *bis* 1543, in Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, 1860, p. 31f.

107 Both Luther and Zwingli held that mass is (as tersely stated in the Heidelberg Catechism) "cursed idolatry." They insisted that enlightened priests must teach this view, but must at the same time continue to say mass, at least in appearance, until the civil government gave liberty to discard it. They held that to abolish mass before such permission was given, was contrary to the best interests of the church and therefore contrary to Christian love. It will be recalled that Luther, after his return from Wartburg Castle, asserted that love toward "the weak" should have prevented the abolishment of the mass by the people of Wittenberg, contrary to the desires of the provincial government. (*Luthers Werke,* Erlangen edition, vol. XXVIII, p. 213; St. Louis edition, vol. XX, col. 14). He did however not demand the re-introduction of the mass in reality, but urged its observance "in appearance." He wrote: "The priests [among his followers] who say mass must omit the words which refer to the sacrifice. . . . They can easily omit these words without the common people ever noticing it and without giving offence." (Erlangen edition, vol. XXVIII, p. 304; St. Louis edition, vol. XX, col. 80). The priests, it is true, would thus satisfy those who desired the further observance of the mass, provided they would not discover the stratagem. But Oecolampad, in the above mentioned letter to Farel, stated that the observance of mass "in appearance" was very offensive to the latter; some of them had evidently taken notice of it. The friends of the Reformation, on the other hand, were supposed to know of the deception used; it is difficult to see, however, that they can have been satisfied with such an attitude of playing fast and loose with fundamental religious practices. Among them it must have been realized that their leaders were paying too great a price for securing the support of the government. Wolfgang Wetter, a priest of St. Gall, who in obedience to the Council of the city continued to say mass though he preached against it, objected to its further observance. He urged that the offence caused to the reform friends was

the state was substituted for the authority of the Scriptures.[108]

In the death sentence pronounced upon Felix Manz he was charged with having boasted of special revelations. He was accused of pretending that "once or twice in prison and elsewhere certain epistles of Paul were revealed to him as if he had them before his eyes." It is by no means certain that Manz' words are correctly reported, but even if this were the case, the accusation would not mean that he pretended he had received new revelations besides Scripture. It would mean that by divine intervention a miracle had taken place.[109]

It is worth noticing in this connection that various miraculous stories were told about the reformers representing state church Protestantism by their friends. The Lutheran reformer Johannes Brenz, so the story goes, was warned by an in-

---

a more serious matter than the displeasure of the "papists." (Kessler, *Sabbata*, p. 204). George Spalatin, an intimate friend of Luther, in a letter to the Elector of Saxony (*Mitteilungen der Geschichts- und Altertumsgesellschaft des Osterlandes*, vol. VI, 1886, p. 119 f) expressed the opinion that to keep up the Roman Catholic ceremonies was not really an act of love toward "the weak" but was hazarding their best interests and served in fact to offend them. He added that many who favored the gospel were also offended. Justus Jonas expressed himself similarly. (*Corpus Reformatorum*, vol. I, p. 631). Andreas Carlstadt wrote a book on the point in question, having the title, *Ob man soll Gemach fahren* ("Whether One Should Go Slowly," namely in abolishing the mass). He severely criticized the idea that doing that which is morally wrong can ever be to any one's real good. Conrad Grebel referred to such compromises as acts of "diabolical prudence." He pointed out that by such a time-serving attitude "God's Word is turned upside down, thrust back, fettered;" in other words, the authority of Scripture is in practice denied. (*Vadianische Briefsammlung*, vol. III, p. 50).

108 Carl Sachsse says of Hubmaier: "He held the Scriptures in even higher esteem, if possible, than Luther." (*Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier a's Theologe*, Berlin, 1914, p. 166). What is stated here concerning Hubmaier applies to the Swiss Brethren as well.

109 Egli, *Actensammlung*, p. 310. The passages quoted to prove that the Brethren did not accept the Scriptures as the only authority for the faith and practice of the church are altogether inadequate. The principal proof for this false supposition has been commonly held to be an expression used by Simon Stumpf at the debate of October, 1523. Stumpf said: "The decision has been made; the Spirit of God decides." (*Zwinglis Werke*, vol. II, p. 784). This has been believed to be an appeal to individual revelation. However, Zwingli's reply to Stumpf was: "This is right," and at the same occasion Zwingli again and again repeated almost the identical expression of Stumpf. (*Ibid*, pp. 470, 793, 799). In various other instances Zwingli also made statements which would probably have been considered unorthodox had they been uttered by one of the Brethren. He wrote, e. g.: "The written Word is to be judged by the inner Word which God has written in the heart." (*Ibid*, vol. IV, p. 77). Leo Judae, his coworker in Zurich, wrote in a letter to Bullinger: "Who has ever before preached so clearly and fearlessly that which our Zwingli has brought to light through the revelation of the divine Spirit?" (Quoted, Pestalozzi, C., *Leo Judae*, Elberfeld, 1860, p. 25). Compare Hadorn, W., *Kirchengeschichte der reformierten Schweiz*, Zurich, 1907, p. 47.

ner voice at the approach of the Spanish army at Stuttgart: "Take a loaf of bread [weighing usually three to four pounds] and go to the upper city, and when you find an open door, enter it and hide under the roof." He found the door of the last house open and did as he was bidden. His hiding place was visited by a hen which laid two eggs for him daily till the danger was past. Now, had Manz told a story like this, there is little doubt but this would have been taken as a proof that he believed in new revelations, and would have been laid to his charge in his death sentence. And was not Luther believed to be a prophet by his early followers? Johann Mathesius, one of his first biographers, mentions various prophecies spoken by Luther which were fulfilled, and then remarks: "With many sure prophecies he confirmed his doctrine."[110] And again: "The beloved man Melanchthon calls our Doctor the last Elijah concerning whom always a prophecy obtained in Christendom."[111] "Thus the Holy Spirit prophesied of this third Elijah, Dr. Martin Luther."[112] It may be recalled that the "Anabaptist" Melchior Hofmann was also believed by his followers to be the third Elijah, and certain writers have taken this as an indication of the fanaticism of the Anabaptists in general. These writers closed their eyes to the fact that there were various distinct "Anabaptist" sects. A spokesman of the Swiss Brethren in the discussions of Bern, in 1538, said: "[Melchior] Hofmann is not recognized as a brother among us but we have resisted him with all earnestness."[113]

Again, concerning George Blaurock it was only recently asserted that, according to a statement made by his followers, he had miraculous visions. The statement in question, however, was made by a witness who admitted that he had not heard this from the lips of Blaurock himself but from another person, who was in no better position to testify, for he conceded that the statement was based on hear-say.[114]

---

[110] Mathesius, J., *Luthers Leben in Predigten,* herausgegeben von G. Loesche, Prague, 1906, p. 399.

[111] *Ibid.,* p. 389.

[112] *Ibid*, p. 414. Among the many writers who spoke of Luther as Elijah Michael Stiefel (of whom we shall hear again later) was one of the first. (In his booklet, *Von dem weyt erschallen Namen Luther, Wass er Bedeüt vnd wie er wirt missbraucht.* Strassburg, 1523). In the title of a book published by Flacius Illyricus in 1548 Luther is spoken of as the third Elijah.

[113] *"Hofman wirtt von vnns khein bruder genempt, Sunder jm widerstannden vf allem Ernnst."* (*Acta des gespraechs,* fol. 59.)

[114] Among the court records of Zurich (Egli, *Actensammlung,* pp. 310 and 313) are found two statements concerning Blaurock's supposed claim of being favored

The view held by many writers that the Swiss Brethren defended Denck's doctrine of "the inner word" is an assumption that cannot be substantiated. Hans Denck taught that the inner word, or the divine voice speaking in the heart, surpasses Scripture in authority,[114*] thus relegating the Scripture ("the external word") to second place.[115] This doctrine directly contradicts the teaching of

---

with visions and new revelations. The second of these statements, as given in the work just mentioned, is unclear and is not found at all in the earlier reprint of the same document. (Füssli, *Beyträge,* vol. I, p. 243 f). The other statement (quoted by Walter Köhler in *Gedenkschrift zum 400 jährigen Jubiläum der Mennoniten oder Taufgesinnten,* p. 60), to the effect that, according to assertions of his friends, he had miraculous visions, was made by a witness who admitted that he did not have any personal knowledge of the matter. He had only repeated what he had heard from another person who, in turn, was in no better position to testify, for he also confessed that he could not speak from first hand knowledge but had said what he had heard from others. Besides, the fact cannot be overlooked that the witness who gave this "third-hand" testimony was strongly prejudiced, being the principal opponent and antagonist of the Brethren. And did not Zwingli and Luther believe in the possibility of new revelations? Regarding Luther's position on the point in question cf. his letters to Melanchthon and Amsdorf, both dated January 13, 1522, from the Wartburg, giving advice how to deal with the so-called Zwickau Prophets. (Enders, E. L., *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel,* vol. III, p. 271ff). He does not condemn new revelations but gives instructions how they may be tested.

114* Hans Denck, as well as Sebastian Franck, pointed out many supposed contradictions found in Scripture as an argument against the value of the letter. To the quotations regarding the position of the Swiss Brethren, as given above, the testimony of the chronicler Fridolin Sicher may be added: "As Scripture reads according to the letter it is authoritative." *Fridolin Sichers Chronik,* herausgegeben von Ernst Götzinger, St. Gallen, 1885, p. 60.

115 It is of interest to notice that Oecolampad defended a view, which approaches the opinion of Denck. He says: "The inner word which is not revealed to us by flesh and blood but by the Father in heaven, is most sure. Through it you shall know that I speak the truth. Therefore I only remind you; I do not teach you. Those who are not yet illuminated but are children need to be taught; therefore Paul says that he is a teacher of the gentiles. But those who are true members of the church and are illuminated can be teachers of others and have no need of an external teacher, as have the ignorant. I speak here of the knowledge of the truth as pertains to salvation. He who has the fountain of all knowledge, the Holy Ghost, can he be ignorant of that which is needful to know?" (Oecolampad, *Demegoriae,* fol. 42a). For a statement and criticism of Oecolampad's view of the inner word see Herzog, *Leben Oecolampds,* vol. II, p. 99. In vain are the sources searched for an expression of similar sentiments by the Brethren. Some of Hans Denck's opponents believed that his views on "the inner word" are to be ascribed to Oecolampad's influence, since Denck had attended his lectures in Basel and the two men had been good friends. (*Ibid.,* vol. I, p. 300). The contents of the book of Oecolampad from which the above citations are taken were given by him originally in the form of public lectures. Concerning Zwingli's teaching on the inner word cf. Maronier, J. H., *Het Inwendig Woord,* Amsterdam, 1890, pp. 21-27, and Grützmacher, R. H., *Wort und Geist, Eine historische und dogmatische Untersuchung zum Gnadenmittel des Wortes,* Leipzig, 1902, pp. 99-108. Two of the Lutheran reformers of Nuremberg, George Pessler and Hector Poemer, wrote in 1524: "Thus the meaning of the New Testament is that God will give all believers His Holy Spirit through whom the love which fulfills the law is shed abroad in our hearts. He in consequence also teaches us all truth, and the preachers are not teachers (*lehr-*

the Brethren on the Scriptures. There is no evidence whatever that they accepted it but there is convincing proof to the contrary. Pilgram Marbeck says to this point:

> We say again that there are not two but only one word of God; and the word of divine, evangelical preaching (which Schwenckfeld calls the word of the letter) is truly the word of the Holy Spirit and of God, for the Holy Spirit, who is God, has spoken through and out of the hearth and mouth of the Apostles.[116]
>
> The external word which is preached, or the word which the Apostles proclaimed, is the Word of God (I Thess. 2:13). It is made power, spirit and life in the heart through faith, as said above; and thus the Holy Spirit, who is God, is received.[117]

Again Pilgram Marbeck says regarding Scripture and its authority:

> We would sincerely admonish every Christian to be on the alert and personally study the Scriptures, and have a care lest he permit himself to be easily moved and led away from Scripture and apostolic doctrine by strange teaching and understanding; but let every one, according to Scripture and apostolic teaching, strive with great diligence to do God's will, seeing that the word of truth could not fail us nor mislead us.[118]

---

meister)but servants and instruments." (*Grunndt vnnd vrsach auss der heiligen schrifft, wie vnd warumb die Eerwirdigen herren baider Pfarrkirchen . . . die misspreüch bey der heyligen Mess abgestelt,* etc., Nuremberg, 1524, sig. C3r). Cf. Möller, W., *Andreas Osiander, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften,* Elberfeld, 1870, p. 527, note 31.

116 Marbeck, *Antwort,* p. 529; cf. p. 518.

117 *Ibid.,* p. 528. Schwenckfeld had accused the Brethren of being "servants of the letter", i. e., of overemphasizing the importance of the letter of Scripture, the written word of God. He was one of a class, or school, called *Spiritualisten,* who held that the Brethren, by obeying Christ's commands at the risk of persecution and death, placed an unwarranted value on the letter of Scripture. The so-called *Spiritualisten* admitted the unscripturalness of infant baptism and other ceremonies, but were nevertheless willing to retain these practices and outwardly conform to the practice of the national churches. Professor Karl Völker, of Vienna, and others, have pointed out that, in Marbeck's *Antwort* to Schwenckfeld, the latter's viewpoint is opposed by the Biblicism of Marbeck. (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 1930, p. 116). Alfred Hegler (in *Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck, eine Studie zur Geschichte des Spiritualismus in der Reformationszeit,* Freiburg i. B., 1892) and Ernst Troeltsch (*Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und ihrer Gruppen,* Tübingen, 1919, pp. 862 ff.) have rightly discriminated between the Brethren and the *Spiritualisten.* Professor Karl Holl, of Berlin, on the other hand, has questioned the correctness of this distinction. Holl defines *Spiritualismus* as "mysticism." (*Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, *Luther,* zweite Auflage, Tübingen, 1923, p. 424), and says: "There is no Anabaptism which is not based on some kind of mysticism." Yet, he concedes that even Luther made statements which savor of mysticism. Contrasting Luther with the dissenters he says: "It never was his intention to eliminate the written Word." (*Ibid.,* p. 279). The obvious inference that the "Anabaptists" of Switzerland intended to eliminate the written Word is absolutely without foundation.

118 *Gedenkschrift,* p. 197.

> We do not believe that a view contradicting the above can be substantiated. But if any one can give us better instruction from Scripture, we will praise God and always yield and give place to the truth.[119]
>
> The above cited Scripture passages treat of the preached and proclaimed word of the Gospel through which we, if we receive it in faith, are born anew and become children of God.[120]

The Brethren recognized the need of the illumination and anointing of the Holy Spirit for the understanding of the Word and for Christian service, and believed that this is granted to those who search the Scriptures with a willingness to accept and follow the light received.[120*] They held that the great truths of the faith, particularly those related to the way of salvation and holiness, are presented clearly in Scripture,[121] and that "higher education" is not a

---

119 *Ibid.*, p. 257.

120 Marbeck, *Antwort*, p. 295.

120* Similar views were held by the leading Protestant reformers. Luther, e. g., wrote: "It is needful to know that God's word is treated [preached] in two different ways. First by those who do not truly believe but have accepted it only outwardly by the letter according to reason. . . . The other way is when the Holy Spirit teaches it and it is not accepted by human thought but God grants the true understanding and experience in the heart. The first will never truly understand it, and yet may become great babblers who boast that they also have read it and understand it very well and can set it forth much better than all others." (*Luthers Werke*, Weimar edition, vol. XII, p. 438). A recent writer on Anabaptists history decried such views, as expressed by representative Hutterian Brethren, as fanaticism. (Müller, L., *Der Kommunismus der mährischen Wiedertäufer*, Leipzig, 1927, p. 23 ff). Andreas Osiander, the Lutheran reformer of Nuremberg, wrote in 1524: "That which is preached to us and is called God's word is in fact only an external voice and human word which proceeds from the mouth of man and comes to naught in the air. But God's word is an inner, spiritual, eternal, hidden word, that is God himself. . . . The external word is not the inner word, but indicates and reveals it." *Ain gut vnderricht vnd getrewer Ratschlag auss hailiger götlicher schrifft, wess man sich in disen zwitrachten, unsern hailigen glauben unnd Christliche Leer betreffend, halten sol*, sig C2v).

121 The modern idea that doctrine should not be authoritatively taught, or accepted on authority, was entirely foreign to the thinking of the Swiss Brethren, though, needless to say, they disavowed human authority in religious things. Not for a moment would they consider the idea that religious truth should not be accepted on the authority of the Word of God. They distinguished, however, between mere intellectual assent and the actual acceptance of the saving truth of the Gospel, resulting in "newness of life." "Whoever hears and believes God's Word," said Pilgram Marbeck, "experiences the new birth, and the Word is made in him spirit and life through faith and the Holy Spirit." (*Antwort*, p. 297; cf. *Zofingen*, fol. 30a). Their Christian experience, i. e. the inner conviction and assurance of the reality of the salvation they had found by accepting the truth of the Gospel, was to them the strongest confirmation of the Bible as God's Word. Their willingness to suffer and die for the faith stands in striking contrast to the nauseating effects of modern relativity. Says a writer in *Neues Wiener Abendlatt* (January 27, 1925): "In our time of religious impotency we can scarcely imagine that there ever were those who laid down their lives for their faith."

prerequisite for spiritual insight. The scholars of the world, including the theologians, were practically a unit in defending the opinion that the Brethren were groping in spiritual darkness and that they should not be tolerated by the political authorities of Christendom. Such was "the consensus of scholarship" in that day, and this was to the Brethren only a proof that it is possible to have the Scriptures and yet, through compromise, be led into serious error.[122] But in their opinion this possibility does not justify any disregard for the letter of Scripture, such as was involved in the compromise of state churchism. As indicated above, they were accused of clinging too close to "the dead letter" of Scripture because they refused to admit that any teaching of the Word may be set aside on the plea of being incompatible with the requirements of love.

In passing it may be worth noticing that none of the writers on the history of the early Swiss Brethren mentions the fact that the Brethren were accused by the Protestant leaders of overemphasizing the need of following the written Word of God. On the contrary, most of these writers are of the erroneous opinion that the state churches insisted on strict adherence to Scripture.

Regarding the relation of the Old Testament Scripture to the New Testament the Brethren differed fundamentally from state church Protestantism. They believed indeed that all Scripture was given by inspiration of God and is inerrantly true in all its statements and doctrinal teachings. Nevertheless they recognized the fact that the relation of the Old to the New Testament Scripture is

---

122 In the great discussions of Bern, in 1538, the principal spokesman of the state church charged that the leaders of the Brethren were too inexperienced and unlearned to pass judgment on such issues; they should leave such questions "to the learned" and occupy themselves with more proper things. (*Acta des Gesprächs*, p. 299). A similar sentiment was expressed by the Council of Schaffhausen, in 1525, in a decision regarding the fact that Sebastian Hofmeister had preached against the mass and infant baptism. They ordered that, "since we have here not any really learned men and cannot know what we should believe," Hofmeister should submit to an examination by the heads of the university of Basel and procure from them, if possible, a sealed testimony "that these views are true." Hubmaier, in his book *Of the Christian Baptism of Believers* (end of chapter VI) expressed the general view of the Brethren when he stated that a knowledge of the ancient languages is useful but its value may easily be overestimated. To depend on the linguists, he says, for deciding doctrinal questions, would be to inaugurate a new popery. Another Moravian "Anabaptist" observed that "those who crucified our Lord knew Latin and Greek and Hebrew (John 19:20), yea, in ancient Rome there was no swine herd that did not speak Latin. At that time it was a common language; now it is considered a great accomplishment."

that of promise to fulfillment, of type and shadow to reality, of the groundwork of a building to the building itself. God's promise under the Old Covenant was that a New Covenant was to be established at the coming of the Redeemer (Jeremiah, chapter 31); and the New Testament Scriptures teach that Christ is "the Mediator of a better covenant" (Heb. 8:6, 7). Christ in the Sermon on the Mount literally quotes from the Old Testament and sets over against it his, "But I say unto you." He also declared that some features of the Old Law had their cause in their "hardness of heart" using the same figure of speech as is found in Ezek. 11:19 and 36:26 in connection with the promise that in the Gospel dispensation "the heart of stone" is to be taken away. A "faultless covenant" was impossible before Christ's coming and His work of redemption. The Old Testament Scriptures were the rule of life for pre-Messianic times. The New Testament obligations ("the law of Christ," Gal. 6:2) are more far-reaching and perfect than the Mosaic Law, and whatever of the Old Law is obligatory for the Christian is also taught in the New Testament Scriptures.

This was the position of the Swiss Brethren concerning the Old Testament. The theologians of the state churches, on the other hand, found themselves compelled to go back to the Old Testament for maintaining the points on which they differed from the Brethren. They believed that in the Old Testament Scriptures they had found ground for defending the union of church and state, the persecution of dissenters, war, etc., for the followers of Christ.[122*] They failed to make the distinction between the Old and New Testament Scriptures on which the Swiss Brethren insisted.[123]

122* Andreas Osiander wrote in 1524: "But if some one would ask here, Why has God abolished the Old Testament? Why does it not also abide forever? To this we reply in brief: God's intention, word and will was never otherwise than that the Old Testament should abide until Christ's advent, and not longer, as Scripture indicates in many places. It nevertheless is and ever will be of God, for if Christ had not come, we would be under obligation to keep it to-day. God has never repented and will in eternity not repent of giving the Old Testament before Christ's coming. It was His eternal will that the Old Testament should be kept before the advent of Christ, and not longer." (*Ain gut underricht,* fol. B4v).

123 The Lutheran theologian Paul Tschackert says that Luther "had no historical understanding of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament," and that in the Reformation period the time was not ripe for such an understanding (Tschackert, P., *Die Entstehung der lutherischen und reformierten Kirchenlehre,* Göttingen, 1910, p. 61). This opinion leaves the Swiss Brethren, Mennonites, and Hutterian Brethren out of consideration. Tschackert says correctly that Luther's approval of the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse had its basis in his wrong conception of the relation of the Old Testament to the New.

The Swiss Brethren expressed themselves regarding the point in question as follows:

> Truly believing Christians use neither the worldly sword nor war, seeing that we are not any more under the Old Law.[124]

Hans Pfistermeyer, a minister of the Brethren, in 1531, in a discussion with state church leaders, said:

> The New Testament is more perfect than the Old, and the Old was fulfilled and interpreted by Christ. Christ has taught a higher and more perfect doctrine and made with His people a New Covenant. Therefore, whatever is found in Christ's doctrine and life [the New Testament Scriptures], I shall recognize as binding for the Christian, and whatever is found otherwise, I shall not so recognize.[125] For I believe that Jesus Christ is the Word of the heavenly Father and has sufficiently taught and declared the will of the Father. I make a great difference between the Old and New Testament and believe that the New Covenant, which was made with us, is much more perfect than the Old that was made with the Jews.[126]

In the debate of Zofingen (1532) the Brethren said:

> Since you demand of us to say what of the shadow is passed and put away, and what is light, we must go back to the foundation than which none other can be laid. We say that the Old is the shadow, and that which is in unison with the words of Christ is light. This is clearly set forth by Christ (Matthew, chapters 20 and 5) when He states the order of the Old Testament and of the world and adds, "But it shall not be so among you."[127]

---

124 *Gedenkschrift,* p. 96.

125 Whatever of Old Testament laws and precepts is not stated in the New Testament Scriptures by precept or example the Brethren considered annulled. Luther on the contrary, in his principal book against Carlstadt (entitled, *Against the Celestial Prophets*), asserted that all that is not expressly forbidden in the New Testament Scriptures may be retained, He says: "We have taught from St. Paul the Christian liberty, that all things should be free which God does not forbid with clear words in the New Testament. . . . Now tell me, where has he forbidden to elevate the host [for worshipful adoration], or commanded it? Show me one little word concerning it and I shall yield." (*Luthers Werke,* Erlangen, vol. XXIX, p. 188). "If they can prove from the New Testament that the images should be removed [from the churches], I shall willingly yield to their desire." (*Ibid.,* p. 150).

126 *Ein Christenlich Gespräch gehalten zu Bern Zwüschen den Predicanten und Hansen Pfyster Meyer von Aarow, den Widertouff, Eyd, Oberkeyt and andere Widertöufferischen Artikel betreffende,* 1531. Similar sentiments are expressed in a confession of faith written for the authorities by the Brethren of Grüningen in the canton Zurich, in June, 1525. (*Füssli, Beyträge,* vol. III, pp. 219-229. A part of this document is found in Burrage, H. S., *A History of the Anabaptists in Switzerland, Philadelphia,* 1882, pp. 178-181).

127 *Zofingen,* fol. 102.

In the great discussion of Bern, in 1538, the Brethren said:

> We confess that the Old Testament is a witness of Christ. We accept it in so far as Christ has not abolished it and as it is in agreement with the New, and in so far as it pertains to faith, love and a true Christian life.[128]

Following is a quotation from a booklet of the Brethren:

> They [the leaders in the state church] have taken measures whereby force is used in matters of faith and conscience through a Mosaic manner of coercion. This is contrary to their first teaching and means that they have reversed themselves and gone back to Moses, that is to say from the light of the sun into the shadow (Heb. 10:1).[129]

In the great debate of Frankenthal in the Palatinate the Swiss Brethren said:

> Since we have been asked concerning the relationship between the two Testaments, we would say that the Old Testament Scriptures offer strong proof that Jesus Christ is the true God and Saviour, the Son of the living God of whom all prophets have testified. . . . Moses points us forward to Christ, our Saviour. . . . We believe that the New Testament surpasses the Old. So much of the Old Testament as is not irreconcilable with the doctrine of Christ, we accept. . . . If anything that is necessary for salvation and a godly life was not taught by Christ and the Apostles but is contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, we desire to be shown.[130]

---

128 *Acta des Gesprächs,* p. 22. Compare the statements made in a debate by Hans Marquart, a Swiss Brethren minister, in 1532. (Joachim von Watt, *Deutsche Historische Schriften,* herausgegeben von Ernst Götzinger, vol. III, St. Gallen, 1879, p. 481.

129 Bullinger, *Widertufferen ursprung,* fol. 217b. Menno Simons says on the point in question: "All Scripture must be interpreted according to the spirit, teaching, walk and example of Christ and the Apostles." (*Opera Omnia Theologica, of alle Godtgeleerde Wercken van Menno Symons,* Amsterdam, 1681, p. 95a; *The Complete Works of Menno Simons,* vol I, Elkhart, Ind., 1871, p. 65a). Dirk Philips, the most prominent co-worker of Menno Simons, and after Menno's death the most influential leader of the Brethren in the lower countries, wrote: "The false prophets cover and disguise their deceptive doctrines by appealing to the letter of the Old Covenant consisting of shadows and types. For whatever they cannot defend by the New Testament Scriptures, they try to establish on the Old Testament, on the letter of the books of the prophets. And this has given rise to many sects and to the many false religious forms. Yea, from this fountain have flowed the sacrilegious ceremonies and pomp of the church of Antichrist and the deplorable errors of the seditious sects [Münsterites and Batenburgers] which in our day, under a semblance of the holy gospel, of the faith and the Christian religion have done great injury and caused much offence." (*Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* vol. X, *De Geschriften van Dirk Philipsz,* The Hague, 1914, p. 341. In the English edition of Dirk Philips' writings, Elkhart, Ind., 1910, p. 323, the translation of this passage is faulty).

130 *Protocoll Franckenthal,* p. 9 ff.

The citations given from the writings and recorded oral testimony of the Swiss Brethren and the Marbeck group of churches indicate that they took the doctrine of the authority of the Scriptures seriously. They condemned the obviously compromising attitude of those who, while defending in theory the sole authority of Scripture, made in fact the civil government the authority to be heeded regarding questions of practical reformation. The theory that a principle or practice may be unscriptural and yet needful for safeguarding the best interests of the church was unacceptable to them. While they held the Scriptures to be the sufficient foundation and rule of faith and practice, they believed that God reveals Himself continuously through Christian experience,[131] in accordance with and in confirmation of His Word, though such experience could never take the place of the Scriptures as the foundation of the Christian faith.

III.

The Trinity.

On the doctrine of the Trinity the Swiss Brethren were orthodox according to the standards of state church Protestantism. Bullinger who gives a comprehensive list of the points on which they differed, or were supposed to differ, from the other churches, does not mention the Trinity and the deity of Christ. He would without question have done so, had there been the slightest ground for a suspicion of unorthodoxy. Again, in the great debates between the Brethren and the state church leaders no such charge was advanced

---

131 Christian experience had to the Brethren a definite meaning. It meant, in the words of Pilgram Marbeck that the written or preached Word "becomes power, spirit and life in the believer's heart;" (Marbeck, *Antwort,* p. 528; cf. *ibid.,* p. 297; *Zofingen,* fol. 30 a). It meant that the believers "experience the grace and power of God in their hearts and in the inmost of their souls," as a writer of the Hutterian Brethren states it. They believed that God manifests and reveals Himself abundantly in the inner experience of the true Christian. It was this personal experience of the truth of the message of Christianity which caused many of them to be "aglow with assurance and certainty." The latter citation is taken from a Hutterian book in manuscript which is in possession of some of the Hutterian colonies in Canada, entitled, *Hand-Büchel wider den proces, der zu Wurms am Rein wider die Brüder so man die Huetterischen nennt ausgangen im* 1557. *Jahr.* (Handbook regarding the mode of procedure decided upon at Worms on the Rhine against the Brethren commonly called Hutterians, in the year 1557). The "process" mentioned is the booklet, *Prozesz wie es soll gehalten werden mit den wiedertäufern durch etliche Gelehrten, so zu Worms versammelt gewesen, gestellt.* Reprinted in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer,* Band I, *Herzogtum Württemberg,* herausgegeben von G. Bossert, 1930, pp. 161-168.

against them. On the contrary, in the disputation of Bern, in 1538, a spokesman of the state church said: "Some have taught that Christ, our dear Lord, was not truly and in very reality God, although I believe that you, dear brethren,[132] are not by any means of this opinion. I do not think this of you."[133]

The Swiss Brethren in a conference held at Strasburg in Alsace, in 1592, expressed themselves concerning the deity of Christ in a letter addressed to the Socinians (Unitarians) of Poland. One of the latter, Christoph Osterod, had in the name of his people written them a letter[134] in which he expressed the hope that they would consent to a union with them.[135] The reply of the Swiss

---

132 The representatives of the Swiss Brethren were in this discussion repeatedly addressed as "brethren" by their opponents. However, at the conclusion of the debate the theologians of the state church declared that they would no longer call them brethren, since they had not been found willing to accept instruction. (*Acta des gesprächs,* p. 302).

133 *Ibid.,* p. 119. The speaker of the state church who made this statement (his name is not given in the protocol) added: "And yet, those who taught this error were called Anabaptists, and there were found among the Anabaptists many obviously injurious, destructive opinions and sects." This statement cannot be questioned since by "Anabaptists" were meant all the various sects which practiced baptism upon the confession of faith, including those who, while they believed the baptism of infants to be unscriptural, practiced it nevertheless in order to escape persecution, such as the followers of Hans Denck (Hans Bünderlin, Christian Entfelder, etc.), Augustin Bader, Jan van Batenburg, David Jöris, and others. Needless to say, the Swiss Brethren were not responsible for the errors of other sects called Anabaptists. Menno Simons says pointedly that among those who rejected every type of "Anabaptism" there were also various sects which differed widely from each other, and it would be folly to ascribe the errors of one of them to all the rest.

134 The Mennonites of the Netherlands, as well as the Hutterians of Moravia, were also approached by the Polish Unitarians with a view of bringing about a union. This was in both instances roundly refused them. Hans de Rijs, the principal Mennonite opponent of the Unitarians in the Netherlands, and the most prominent elder (bishop) of the Waterlandian Mennonites, was personally visited and interviewed by Christoph Osterod and another Unitarian. Since the Waterlandians were less conservative than the other Mennonite groups, Osterod and his friends entertained the hope that they could be won for a union with the Unitarians. The Waterlandians, however, through their spokesman Hans de Rijs, took the ground that "union is not only undesirable but impossible." He wrote in consequence a strong defence of the deity of Christ, entitled, *Clear Proof of the Preexistence and Deity of Jesus Christ* (*Klaer Bewys van de Eeuwigheydt ende Godheydt Jesu Christi,* Haarlem, 1672), which was published after his death. Cf. note 8. The position of the Hutterian Brethren on the deity of Christ is set forth by Andreas Ehrenpreis, head pastor of the churches in Hungary, in a booklet entitled, *Kurze Widerlegung des grossen streitz von Christo Jesu dem Sohn Gottes, wie er von Christoff Osteroth in seinem im Druck ausgangenen Büchel sammt seinem Anhang, als Polnischen Brüdern oder Arrianern, schimpflich und nachtheilig verkleinert wird,* 1654. This book is found in manuscript in some of the Hutterian communities in western Canada.

135 The letter of the Polish Unitarians to the Swiss Brethren at Strasburg, dated October 20, 1591, was found by Theodor Wotschke in the city library of Bern, and published with an introduction and notes in "Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte," vol. VII, pp. 137-154.

Brethren is contained in the first mentioned letter.[136] The Brethren addressed the Socinians as "dear men" and emphatically declared their teaching to be altogether unscriptural and unacceptable. They stated that they could not receive them as brethren in the case of a visit by them. We quote the concluding sentences of this document:

> Here you have briefly our unanimous declaration of our confession concerning Jesus Christ, the Son of God, nay indeed the confession of Scripture according to the measure of our faith. We send it to you hoping that you will consider this matter and will not doubt God's almighty power, but will assent to the truth; for believing is not a decision of human reason but it is the acceptance of that which is incomprehensible to reason. The God-fearing will believe and trust God's Word in that which seems to human reason impossible. Therefore, dear men, fear God and ask Him for understanding, that our hope and joy may be fulfilled. This is our desire for you from Him who is and was and shall be in eternity.[137]

The erroneous view advanced by a few writers, that the Swiss Brethren held the deity of Christ to be non-essential, arose mainly from a misunderstanding of a statement made by the Brethren, in 1555, in a conference held at Strassburg. The document containing this statement is entitled: *Agreement of the Brethren and Elders Gathered at Strassburg on the Question of the Origin of the Human Body of Christ.*[138] As indicated in the title, this *Agreement* does not treat on the deity of Christ but on the view of the incarnation held by Menno Simons[139] and the Brethren of the lower countries.[140] In this *Agreement* the Swiss Brethren deplore the fact that

---

136 The letter of the Swiss Brethren was published in an appendix to the work *Handelinge Der Vereenigde Vlaemse en Duytse Doopsgezinde Gemeynen Gehouden tot Haerlem Anno* 1649, Vlisssingen, 1666, under the title, *An Answer of the Swiss Brethren, also named Upper Germans, to the Polish, Concerning the Point of the Incarnation and the Deity of Jesus Christ.* In the great disputation of Frankenthal in the Palatinate, from May 28 to June 19, 1571, between the Swiss Brethren and the Reformed theologians of Heidelberg, the latter recognized the fact that the Brethren believed in the true deity of Christ.

137 A postscript to this letter states: "Passed at the general gathering of the elders and ministers from many countries, held in the year 1592 at Strasburg. . . . Translated from the High German into Low German, from Rauf-bits own handwriting." Rauf-bits is Rauf Bisch, one of the leading spokesmen of the Brethren in the disputation of Frankenthal in the Palatinate, in 1571.

138 Ten Cate, S. Blaupot, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Groningen,* vol. I, Leeuwarden, 1842, pp. 254-257; Hulshof, *Doopsgezinden te Straatsburg,* pp. 220-222.

139 Cf. note 8.

140 The supposition that the Swiss Brethren by this statement repudiated the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, as stated in "Mennonitische Blaetter," Elbing,

peace and brotherly unity have been destroyed by the controversy on a point which is non-essential, namely Menno's doctrine of the incarnation. They say further:

> As we have been trying to build, as it were, a useless tower, the Lord has confounded our language, so that scarcely any one can understand the other. This may have been caused by a presumption on our part to know more than we should know, and that we have failed to give heed to the Scripture which says, "Things which are too difficult for you, do not inquire into, and what is too great for you do not desire to decide. Ecclesiasticus 3."

Germany, September 1930, p. 100, is unacceptable. Similar assertions have been made concerning Menno Simons, namely that in his opinion the Word was changed into flesh, and that Jesus, during His earthly life, was a man only. (Samuel Cramer, Hauck, *Real-Encyklopädie,* vol. XII, 591, 607). This assertion contradicts Menno's repeated clear statements. He emphatically taught the two natures in Christ. (*Opera Omnia Theologica,* 1681, p. 372a, *Complete Works,* 1871, vol. II, p. 164a; *Opera,* p. 525b, *Works,* vol. II, p. 330b; *Opera,* p. 363b, *Works,* vol. II, p. 153b; *Opera,* p. 569a, *Works,* vol. II, 375b.) Dirk Philips wrote: "He who does not confess the eternal Godhead and true humanity of Jesus Christ is an antichrist." (*Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* vol. X, p. 152; Philips, D., *Enchiridion, or Handbook of the Christian Doctrine and Religion,* Elkhart, Ind., 1910, p. 114). Menno Simons taught distinctly that Jesus' body was in its substance like that of all men; he did not hold that the natural flesh is inherently evil, as has been supposed by a few writers. Again, the statements made by Karel Vos (*Menno Simons, Zijn Leven en Werken en zijne Reformatorische Denkbeelden,* Leiden, 1914, pp. 72 and 211) and W. J. Kühler (Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* vol. VIII, p. 553), that the early Mennonites "refused to acknowledge the Holy Ghost as a person" is not based on fact. Menno said repeatedly that he confessed "a personal Holy Spirit." (*Opera,* p. 389b; *Works,* vol. II p. 186b.) Dirk Philips made the same statement. (*Bibl. Ref. Neerl.,* vol. X, p. 396; *Enchiridion,* p. 382). In his *Confession of the Triune God* Menno Simons says, the supposition that "Christ had a beginning as a creature" is "an opinion which all true Christians look upon as a terrible error, curse and abomination." (*Opera,* p. 387 b; *Works,* vol. II, p. 184).

(To be continued.)

THE BACKGROUND AND CAUSES OF THE FLIGHT OF THE MENNONITES FROM RUSSIA IN 1929

II

BENJAMIN H. UNRUH

Bolshevism is a radical expression of orthodox Marxism and its materialistic philosophy.[1]

Hegel saw in history, as is well known, the process of self-development of the absolute spirit, a process which progresses "dialectically", that is, in antitheses which follow each other and maintain a balance. With Hegel it is a lack of all we today call realistic thinking. He spiritualizes and rationalizes reality. Marx, who retains Hegel's dialectical method, views reality not from above from the standpoint of spirit, but from below, from the standpoint of man and his natural material urges and needs. He views reality from the point of view of the struggle of man to satisfy these natural urges which are constantly increasing in strength along with increase in production and the development of technique and civilization. Hegel's antitheses become in the hands of Marx the social antitheses of the class struggle. In the struggle to satisfy the material wants of man and to secure and to make secure life and property, society divides itself into two classes—oppressors and oppressed. Today the oppressed class is the working class. Marx presents himself as the defender of the oppressed proletariat and summons it to the struggle against the oppressor, which is the capitalistic "bourgeoisie". The only escape from the misery of slavery is the revolutionary victory of the class struggle. Marx does not only desire to examine reality philosophically; he wants to revolutionize reality. He accuses philosophy of *interpreting* reality rather than *forming* it.

Marxian thinking is characterized by this rejection of speculation, this strict realism and revolutionary motive; but just as characteristic is its one-sided economic materialism. For Marxism, eco-

[1] On the connection between Russian Bolshevism and Marxism or historical materialism compare Fritz Lieb: "Christentum und Bolschewismus," in *Das Notbuch der russischen Christenheit*, Berlin. 2. Auflage. 1930, pp. 197 ff.

nomic conditions and the class struggle which inevitably arises out of them are the only factors which determine reality. The spiritual and psychical aspects of reality are only an idealogical superstructure, a reflex of economic conditions. Belief in God and religion are to be refuted from practical considerations, for idealistic and religious thinking leads to a dangerous aberration from reality and thus cramps revolutionary energy which is necessary for the recreation of reality and upon which alone the classes can depend in the class struggle. Marx's starting point is society and not some spiritual idea. The goal of his revolutionary thinking and striving is a society without classes. He will have nothing of the abstract "man", for he sees only the man who exists in reality as an active human being. He points out that this man has been dehumanized in the proletariat. He wishes to restore this loss which the enslaved proletariat suffered by the restoration of the "human". But at the same time this man is robbed by Marx and his followers of his highest spiritual and moral worth by the denial of the spirit and of God. In Marx's hands man becomes simply a segment of a great de-personalized mass, simply an existence. The ethical demands which insist upon asserting and preserving the dignity of the human being are transformed into their opposite, so that as a consequence man is robbed of his dignity by the denial of his ultimate essential quality. Economic exploitation fades into insignificance compared to the spiritual and moral depravity produced by this robbery. Marx really dehumanizes man by a process which reduces man to an abstraction. In other words, Marx is simply an inverted Hegel —a Hegel who has fallen from the clouds, but who has not lost the art of philosophic speculation by his fall. He simply speculates in reverse from the opposite end of the chain. His materialism is everything else but realistic thinking.

The antithesis to Christianity as well as to religion in general is fundamental with the founders of Marxism. Engels says, "We want to destroy everything which claims to be supernatural and superhuman. . . . For this reason we have declared war on religion and religious conceptions once for all and care nothing about the fact that we may be called atheists or something else like it."[2] For Engels, man himself is God and there is no other God but he.

The sharp antithesis between Christianity and Marxism is particularly striking in the realm of eschatological ideas. In place of the kingdom of God, Marxism has the future society which is to be created by the man-god who, by the power of his reason, will be

2 "Die Lage Englands," *Nachlass* Bd. I, p. 485.

able to solve all social problems and wipe out the entire social question in the new society without classes.

Now it is this philosophy of society and history and this conception of man which Bolshevism has put into actual practice in Russia. The faith of Marx and Engels is here put into operation consistently and radically. Here we have a steam roller which destroys everything that stands in its way. *This is the ultimate meaning of what is happening in Russia today.*

Socialistic materialism and atheism has a rich and extensive tradition in Russia itself, as Lieb justly emphasizes. Although it is true that this tradition is really based upon Hegelian idealism or, more precisely stated, on the atheistic neo-Hegelianism of Feuerbach, Lenin was preceded by a whole series of revolutionary thinkers, such as Herzen, Bakunin, Belinsky, and their followers. The radical wing of the Russian intelligentsia followed this philosophical road more and more consistently and finally found its revolutionary leader in Lenin, the disciple of Marx. Dostoievsky saw clearly and prophesied whither this development would lead. Compare for instance his "Great Inquisitor" in the novel, *The Brothers Karamazov,* his *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (1863) and his *Notes Out of a Cellar* (1864). The enmity of Bolshevism to religion is thus a traditional and fundamental one. This is evidenced quite unmistakably by its classic and popular literary expressions.

The slogan created by Lenin in December, 1905, which has since become a leading revolutionary motif, is well known, namely, "Religion is opium for the people". Lenin views religion as a sort of spiritual whiskey in which the slave of capitalism drowns his human personality, his claim to his right to at least a partially human existence. Lenin also draws the logical consequence in practical policies from this fundamental position—the principle which was set up in the Erfurt Pronunciamento of 1891 by the German Social-Democratic party, "Religion is a private matter," is for him only a statement of the relation of the state to religion, not of the communistic party to religion. Being the organization of the class-conscious leaders in the struggle for the liberation of the working classes, the Party dare not take a neutral attitude toward obscurantism in religious form. For Lenin the root of religion is to be found in the social exploitation of the working masses. For this reason the struggle against religion is an absolute necessity in the class struggle. He passionately demands atheistic propaganda. Every defense and justification of the idea of God appears to him as political risk, as he indicates in a letter to Gorki in 1913. Ap-

parently Lenin cannot view religion as a mere soap bubble, as Gorki does, which might some time burst of its own accord. Active warfare is necessary. Lenin is a dynamic revolutionist who not only theorizes, but who never remains the mere speculative thinker and rather fights to create reality according to his ideas. Therefore his fundamental antipathy to religion expresses itself in a practical warfare on religion with the purpose of destroying it.

The slogans developed by the master demonstrate to the present time the theory and practice of the master's disciples; they control the general cultural policy of the Soviet Union as well as its specific religious policy. The needs of the class struggle determine goal and means, principles and measures. Religion is viewed as a poison, an opiate, a narcotic, a pest, to say nothing of the fact that it is also a fraud, an idiotic spiritual disease. It is viewed as the means by which the ruling and oppressing classes confuse the people in order to enslave them more and more in the most hopeless slavery. The might of the oppressing classes stands or falls with this religious madness.

Johann Most, who was born in Augsburg in 1848, first a Social-Democrat, then an anarchist, wrote a pamphlet entitled *Die Gottespest* while he was a political refugee in London. This pamphlet was re-published in the Zentral-Völker-Verlag, Moscow in 1930, a very characteristic procedure. This little book rages against "the newest sprouts on the tree of religion", (the Trinity is meant), against the "official cloud-movers and hell-benders", against the "stinkenden Mist in der Bibel". God is a ghost invented by clever swindlers, and whoever preaches this swindle in any form must be either a fool or a scoundrel. But the deceived masses will become unwilling to pay further attention to such trickery and will no longer let themselves be turned into monkeys and fools by it. Some day they will put all the crucifixes into the fire; they will transform the chalices into useful objects; will turn the churches into theaters, and meeting places into granaries. The most blatant intellectualism of the enlightenment characterizes this booklet, an intellectualism and which has nothing at all to do with the ethical sentimentality of a movement which claims to defend the oppressed, as will be seen for instance in the following quotation: "The more man depends upon religion, the more he will believe; the more he believes, the less he knows; the less he knows, the more stupid he becomes; and the more stupid he is, the better he can be ruled."

The tone and content of this pamphlet by Johann Most is quite characteristic of all the popular Bolshevistic propaganda a-

gainst religion. One should read for instance a little booklet of thirty-two pages published by the Crimean State Press in 1930 entitled *Der Klassenfeind unter der Sutane* (*The enemy of the people under the Cassock*). According to this pamphlet, the great majority of the proletariat and the poorer peasants support socialism. The classes which fight socialism are the "NEP" people, the Kulaks, and their faithful allies, the clergy, without distinction of denomination. Religion has always operated as a faithful servant of God on the side of the capitalistic organization, as evidenced by the fact that church discipline was used very extensively against the working people. The pulpit is used by the priest as a platform for the spread of counter-revolutionary propaganda among the backward elements of the peasantry. The pamphlet is especially bitter in its attack on the Lutheran and Catholic churches, whose clergy are accused of espionage for foreign countries and secret organizations in behalf of the "Whites". But religion is gradually being overwhelmed by the victorious progress of communism. This is the reason for the bitter resistance of the clergy. "It is time to break the shameful chains and cast them aside; it is time that we free ourselves from the helpers and handmen of capitalism; it is time that we put an end to everything which hinders the victorious progress of socialism."

In the little pamphlet called *Kulturfeldzüge* by A. Fichtner (Zentral-Völker-Verlag, Moscow, 1930) religion is represented as the most dangerous enemy and the most bitter opponent of the Soviet state. This discussion follows an attack on illiteracy and alcohol. It is documented with incidents taken from the German Lutheran and Catholic villages. The masses of the peasants in the German colonies are still altogether in the power of religious superstition. For this reason the sects who are the most clever religious sharpers and the ones behind whom the counter-revolutionary and foreign imperialists are fighting, exert very great influence on the colonists even at present. "For this reason it is our duty to continue the bitterest warfare against religion; against preachers and the sects. We must not only deprive these open enemies of our Soviet state of all economic opportunity, we must overcome them intellectually, we must carry the fight into the masses. Nothing must be left unturned to alienate even the last peasant from them and to disclose them as they really are, as hypocrites, crooks who fatten themselves at the expense of the working classes, counter-revolutionaries who do everything to damage us and to bring the working peasant masses under their destructive leadership." The pamphlet

concludes with a final summons to the most intense warfare on the religious madness which is placed on a level with drunkenness, profligacy, laziness, filth, and lewdness.

In this connection it may be interesting to note that Mennonite communists are participating in this fanatical warfare on religion. I have before me two pamphlets—*The Sects and the Proletarian Revolution* by A. Reinmarus and G. Friesen, which appeared in Moscow in 1930 in Russian in the *Library of the Militant Atheists,* and *The Sects and Socialistic Reconstruction* by N. Dück, published at Kharkov, 1930. In the pamphlets mentioned earlier it is the "churches" which were attacked primarily, but in these it is the "sects" and in particular the Mennonites, who are attacked and that in the most malicious fashion. It is Mennonite sons who curse the religion of their fathers. Note the following paragraph from N. Dück's booklet: "The characteristic class character of religion reached a high point of development in the comparatively narrow confines of the German sectarian religious groups, and for this reason the sects, in-so-far as they are genuine sects, are opposed to our great reconstructive movement." Dück produces proof that the Bible and socialism are fundamentally irreconcilable. The Biblical teaching is separated from the socialistic revolution by an abysmal chasm just as it is separated from true freedom and the attainment of a communistic society. It is just this "pure and undefiled Christianity" which has constantly offered itself to the oppressor ruling classes as a means for active resistance or hidden sabotage to the socialistic progress (p. 15).

N. Dück criticizes the "organizational structure of the sectarian congregations," and emphasizes that it is only the external form of the organization which appears to have democratic character. But this formal democracy has not hindered the preachers of the Mennonite congregations, although chosen by the people, from coöperating with the Mennonite civil authorities in repressing and crushing the poor peasants as "rebel" elements. "Is it not true that among the Mennonites the rich and the prosperous have been the respected and influential elements in the congregations, in spite of all the democratic demonstration. In the sectarian religions before the war it is true that the 'equality of all' was supposed to rule, but in reality the word of one wealthy land-owner always had much more influence than the opinion of the entire poor element." Dück asserts that excommunication was never applied to the rich although it was frequently put into effect against the poor members

who had to attend services with patched clothes and thread-bare garments. The preachers of the sects always served and do now serve, according to Dück, the interests of the capitalistic class, even though they themselves are poverty-stricken. It is from the oppressors that they receive their charity. "Das Sein bestimmt das Bewusstsein"—is a slogan from Marx which Dück repeats as he scatters his slanders. "This material dependence, and the fact that the 'pure' Biblical principles lead to strict condemnation of even the mildest resistance to the existing social order which has been established by God, explain why the decisions of the most varied sectarian groups, conferences, and congregations in questions large or small always defend the interests of the conservative and wealthy social classes as holy and untouchable."

Occasionally Dück has a word to say about the "deep religious spirit of the sects," but this makes little difference, for "the antithesis between our program and the religious life of the sects" is unbridgable. The sects advocate love for one's neighbor in place of the struggle of the oppressed against the oppressors. The "holy sense" of family relationship hinders the attainment of all the objectives of the party and the government among the villages of the sects.

Basically the sectarian is not so pious as he seems. "The Kulak carries a hypocritical appearance of piety and influences the less wealthy and the poor element to try also to be pious. The Bible is used as an excuse to undermine the entire Soviet system, to weaken the class struggle, to oppose the introduction of new forms of life and work." The "Word of God" is the primary means to this end.

The booklet continues in this tone. It closes with the slogan, "Fight". "Daily systematic struggle is necessary. Continuous disclosure of the class character of even the 'purest' religion, unceasing disclosure of the antithesis between Christianity and socialism, between the sects and the socialistic program, the program which leads by means of bitter class struggle to doing away with classes."

The Bolshevists are men of deeds. They lay claim to the entire man for the one great cause for which they are concerned. They want to lead men into the struggle unweakened, undivided by an idealistic and religious ideology which is out-moded. Nothing is to distract the revolutionary fighter from his great goal, neither wife nor child, neither religion nor church, neither science nor art, both of which are to be put into service as handmaids of the revolutionary idea in the gigantic struggle. It is the "earthly" which dominates here, the necessities of this world which dictate and in-

spire self-reliance. For religion, according to Lenin, is the conception of a man who has not yet found himself, or has lost himself again. Men are not to revolve about the sun, but about themselves. Lenin's widow, Krupskaja, likewise emphasizes that the sentimental pharisaical Christianity which is the poisonous weapon of the "bourgeoisie" is diametrically opposed to the class interests of the proletariat. "Slave ideas must be cut out, slave feelings must be suppressed, slave words must be torn out with glowing iron." For Bukharin the true harm of religion lies in its "psychology of despair", in its flight from the earth, in its tendency to discount the earthly.

Just as sharp as the antithesis to religion is the protest of Bolshevism against the Christian ethic. This ethic must be displaced by a class ethic. In the interest of the class struggle everything is to be allowed. Whatever furthers the interests of the proletariat is moral and right. But one power is recognized by Bolshevism, and that is the all-power of "economic necessity". For this reason there is for Bolshevism but one ethical norm—ethical is everything which promotes the communistic idea. The codes of previous ethics are to be shattered; above all, love of parents for their children, of children for their parents. The love of parents is commonly a pernicious love. The child who has been reared in the family usually becomes anti-social. "We recommend that youth should honor only such fathers as have a proletarian revolutionary point of view and expressly defend the interests of the proletarian class. Other fathers must be transformed by their communistic children. We do not recognize the principle of respect to parents as a necessary principle." The family must therefore be displaced by the communistic party.

Bolshevism claims absolute authority as Christianity does. This is the one purely *formal* point in which it touches our religion. In general, however, Christianity and Bolshevism are absolute antitheses, since the latter teaches the emptying of man of his divinity, his spirituality, his personality, and thereby his self-direction and his eternal worth, by means of the "destruction of God", while the former teaches the reconciliation of God and man, the liberation and completion of the free human personality by this very relation with God. Christianity not only teaches, but makes eternal life possible.

Perhaps Christianity and Bolshevism touch each other in another point naturally as well as formally, namely in the eschatalogical attitude. The eschatalogy of Bolshevism is "a secularized

eudaimonism", that is, the goals of its philosophy of life and revolutionary program are exclusively to be found in this world. They are concerned only with happiness and progress in this earth. Bolshevism desires to build a new world with "hammer and sickle" out of its own strength, for the glorification of the *man-god,* whereas the king of the kingdom which is hoped for and worked for and prayed for by the Christian is the *God-man* who is in the struggle as the "co-worker of God". Bolshevism rejects the present age. It builds with passionate zeal for the golden age, it has no continuing city here, it seeks one to come, the society without classes. Everywhere we find here Christian ideals with reversed content, or in other words, everywhere we find anti-Christianity.

V

The philosophical program of the communist party on matters of religion and any type of piety was at once made political practice when the party obtained the dictatorship. It determined throughout the policy of the Bolshevist state toward the church. At once the almighty state which had all power in its hands while its opponent, the church, was the helpless and defenseless prey of the despotism of the state, inaugurated a practical program to destroy the religion and church which it hated so infernally. The sharp and undisguised revolutionary atheistic attitude, at times almost pitifully sentimental, produced a whole system of war measures in the struggle which were directed chiefly against the former state church, but naturally not alone against it, but against all denominations. The means used to destroy religion are in general the following: prohibition of religion, persecution of the clergy and the believers, closing of churches and monasteries, destruction of the family, the propaganda of the godless, that is, the spread of atheism, the breaking up of the previous system of ethics and morals—these were the means which have been put into practice by law, by terror, and by systematic disintegration.

1. *The legal measures.* The basic decree of the 23rd of January, 1918, separated state and church. By this decree the Orthodox Church was thoroughly freed from the old ruined state. The connection with the old state had become a double burden for the church. First, the close relation which had existed between the church and the state threatened to make the catastrophe of the state the catastrophe of the church. Peter the Great had abolished the patriarchate, and the Czar had become the only head of the church. The Bolshevist decree of 1918 therefore meant the end of the Caesaro-papism. The decree had universal historic significance,

for here the Constantinian era in the relation of church and state was brought to an abrupt conclusion; the Christian church in the East was again persecuted by the heathen, yes, sub-heathen state. (The ancient heathen state was always religious.)

The church ceased to be a legal entity. It was forbidden to buy or sell anything; it dared not tax its members. The clergy, from the highest prince of the church to the lowliest candle boy, no longer enjoyed the franchise; they no longer were permitted to occupy a civil or social office, because they did not belong to the working class, that is, they were reckoned as parasites. All charitable activity was forbidden in the church, and, together with this, all ecclesiastical institutions and activities which were not exclusively attended for purposes of worship were abolished and forbidden. The higher hierarchical ecclesiastical organizations were no longer registered and, according to a regulation of August 10, 1922, were dissolved. Other religious societies were no longer permitted to issue official legislation and dared not hold local or general conferences, at least not without a special permit which was difficult or impossible to secure, and then only under the strictest police control and most severe censorship of all the resolutions which were to be adopted. Only the religious societies of lower rank were allowed (until the year 1929), as "cult groups" with a minimum of twenty members and "religious associations" with a minimum of fifty members, the minimum age in each case for membership being eighteen years. The rejection of application for membership on the basis of immoral character of the candidates was forbidden, thus permitting the state to interfere directly in the most intimate and autonomous sphere of the purely religious life of ecclesiastical bodies in spite of its fundamental rejection of all religion. The lesser religious societies were permitted the right of free confession of religion but not the right of a legal entity. They could contract only with the state to rent church buildings and church property, a contract which the state could annul at any time for the purpose of closing the churches if this were demanded by the local population. That these "demands" of the population have been in nearly every case purely fictitious may be mentioned in passing. For the most part these demands were made on the pretext of securing "additional space" or because of the excess zeal of local communistic groups. It happened sometimes that school children were persuaded by their communistic teachers to sign a petition demanding the closing of a church.

As the economic policy has been made more radical since the

fifteenth party congress (at the close of 1925), so also the religious policy has been made more radical by the authorities. The decisive battle is raging on all fronts and is being fought out likewise on the religious front where "militant atheism" has swung into a mighty offensive. In the middle of April, 1929, the new religious law appeared which had been announced already in the previous summer, a law in which the ecclesiastical regulations of the Soviet Union are definitely codified.

By this law the religious-hierarchical organizations are granted the basic right of becoming legal entities. The same is true for the governing bodies of local religious groups, as well as for the governing bodies of religious societies (the Churches themselves however not being so recognized). But this concession seems to be designed for the purpose of making it possible to make these governing bodies responsible for everything which happens in the religious groups, whether real or supposed, so that they may be called to account before the law. This responsibility of the legal entity before the law is emphasized very much in the law. Further, these governing bodies are granted the power of supervision and control of their churches, the use of seals and printed forms, the convening of synods and the right to address complaints to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

In addition to these concessions, limited as they are, the new law of April 8, 1929, contains the most unbearable restrictions, not to say artifices. (The attainment of the right of a legal entity is made very difficult, the registration of ecclesiastical bodies can be refused without ground, etc.)

The pastoral activity of all clerical officials is limited to the place of their permanent residence. Itinerant preaching, evangelistic preaching, guest preaching, are all made impossible or permitted on the basis of special official sanction which is taxed very highly. On the basis of this regulation a great number of church buildings were destroyed as superfluous or closed or used for other purposes. For instance, the famous Isaac Cathedral in St. Petersburg was turned into an anti-religious museum.

The heaviest blow to the churches was the destruction of their influence on the life of the people, especially in the matter of training the youth. It is not necessary to mention details here, but every church congregation is forbidden, as already mentioned, any type of social or charitable activity, educational activity of any sort, the holding of Bible courses and religious meetings, special services for separate ages, sexes, etc., etc. The regulations concerning religious

instruction are well known. According to the basic decree private instruction was especially permitted and according to the decree of June 13, 1921, instruction for persons over eighteen years was permitted in the church. Today all forms of religious instruction in school or church are forbidden, and, if religious instruction is given in the home the number of participating children, even when they are brothers and sisters, is limited to three.

All these legal restrictions (and they are not given here in their entirety) are not enforced throughout Russia with equal severity, although no one can be sure that the application of the law will not suddenly begin in its sharpest form. We have record of a whole series of severe cases where the Mennonite Church officials have been hit severely by these regulations.

2. *Terrorism* in religious matters raged most intensely at the time of the so-called war communism. The tension between the Orthodox Church and the revolutionary government was very strong at that time and reached its height when the Patriarch Tychon formally "banned" the Soviet government. At that time the government had hundreds and thousands of the clergy arrested and accused. Arrests and exile were, however, also the lot of the pastors of other religious bodies. The anti-clericalism of that time swept the clergy away like a cyclone. They were completely helpless and had to suffer for all and for everything. Every tendency to revolt among the people was blamed upon them as an evidence of political conspiracy. The war against the church was not confined to legislative and administrative measures. It led finally to a systematic campaign against the churches, which began with the exposure of the relics and ended with the confiscation of all the treasures of the church. The high point of this campaign came in the Stalin regime, and especially in its latter half. The radicalization of the internal political situation has led to increased intensity in the spiritual struggles. The measures which have been taken in economics, education, and religion are destroying whatever illusions may have been entertained with regard to the evolution of Bolshevism in the direction of liberalism, democracy, and toleration.

There have been breathing spells in the terroristic procedure of the government against the church, but they have always been followed by still more merciless radical phases of the ecclesiastical policy. The Patriarch Tychon, after a period of rest, was compelled to sign a document promising to enforce in the church complete abjuration of all political activity. This declaration by Tychon was, at the same time, a recognition of the Soviet government.

The lately deceased Prince Gregory Trubetzky compares this action of Tychon with the procedure of the Metropolitan of Moscow, Alexios, in the time of the Tatars who went to the headquarters of the Tatar Khan and greeted him with respect in order to soften his wrath against Russian people.[3]

In the summer of 1927 the Metropolitan Sergius of Nizhni Novgorod, the successor of the Patriarch, addressed his pastoral letter to all the clergy and laity, in which he described his endeavors to regulate the relations of the Orthodox Church to the Soviet state. The Orthodox Church thus decided once and for all to follow the path of loyalty to the government. Further Sergius announced a general council, which however has not been called to the present date.

Sergius pronounced the interdict against various bishops who opposed him, temporarily forbidding them the exercise of their episcopal office and, when at the beginning of the year 1930, the protest movement against the religious persecutions in Russia reached their high point, Sergius issued a declaration that in Russia there had not been any religious persecution. By all these measures Sergius wanted to purchase the freedom of religious instruction for children. He did not succeed in easing the situation, however, for it has become but more oppressive and involved.

Professor Arseniev, in the periodical *Religiose Besinnung,* Volume I, No. 2, pp. 166ff, justly emphasizes the fact that the ecclesiastical policy of Sergius is only an episode in the mighty struggle for the soul of the Russian people, that the tragic strife can no longer be stopped with such means. The struggle must be carried out to the bitter end, for it is the result of a basic antithesis between Christianity and anti-Christianity, which lies outside the realm of politics and diplomacy.

3. The chief means in the *program of disintegration* is the anti-religious propaganda which has its leadership in the "league of the godless". This league is the priest and prophet of the atheistic state. It is not a "voluntary association" in our western sense, but a branch of the communistic party, a department of the party for dealing with religious matters, as may be seen from the method of financing the league and the organization of its work. (The leaders and workers of the league are furnished by the communistic youth league and the entire party organization, down to the smallest local unit, in village and factory, is put at its service.) The state and its party quite openly puts at the disposal of the league all

[3] Trubetzky, *Die Glaubensverfolgung in Sowjetrussland,* Wernigerode, 1930. p. 46.

its governmental institutions and organizations, above all, school and press.

For this reason one is amazed that the anti-religious propaganda has so little success. In the midst of persecution and tribulation the faith of the Christian has maintained its superiority and victorious power, the power of patience, of forgiving and suffering love. An attractive power, the power of a new understanding with which it is possible to break the influence of the anti-religious propaganda with its at times tasteless and crude excesses, at times more or less intellectual and pseudo-scientific notions and presentation. For example, there is a procedure which is based on the Russian philosopher, N. F. Fedorov, (died 1903), who explains the religious foundation of civilization and whose teachings reveal to us the power of Christianity to transform the world.

The latest achievement of the Soviet program is the so-called "anti-religious movement". In reality this is but a more intensified anti-church campaign. The church as a concrete social organization, with its priests and pastors as its officials, and with its tangible property assets, above all its buildings, is now the object of attack by the atheistic state. Thousands of churches have been closed, the clergy live in great numbers in exile, the remaining clergy are losing their right to residence in the local communities. They cannot secure the books of the coöperatives necessary to purchase goods to support themselves and their families. Their children dare not attend school. For the first time, the situation of the church in the Soviet Union has become truly critical. Consider for instance the destruction of Sunday.

The anti-religious propaganda and movement makes use of books, periodicals, pamphlets, cartoons, lectures, the drama, the film, the procession—especially the procession which mocks the church procession. It also uses in increasing measure instruction in the school and the youth movement in the forms of the so-called "Pioneers". In addition to the literary propaganda of the campaign, whether in crude form or in the form of philosophical writings with scientific atmosphere, a ceremonial substitute for religion has been devised in the Red baptism in the name of the Red flag. This is the atmosphere in which the Mennonite and other colonists in Russia have now been living for more than a decade. Who can wonder that emigration, that flight which is also not forbidden by the Holy Scripture but even under certain circumstances required, is viewed as the only way of salvation for the church, for the family, for the child, and for the soul.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF MARTIN MELLINGER

Translations of the Correspondence of Martin Mellinger with relatives in the Rhenish Palatinate, 1807-1839

Translated and Edited by HAROLD BENDER

The original material on early American Mennonite history is gradually being enlarged, though it is still very slight. A recent and interesting addition is the correspondence of Martin Mellinger. for over fifty years deacon in the Mennonite Church which bears his name, five miles northeast of Lancaster in Lancaster county, with a brother-in-law Johannes Weber in Kindenheim in the Palatinate, Germany, his old home.

Martin Mellinger (Möllinger in the German), emigrated from the Palatinate with his sister in 1772, at the age of twenty, having lost his parents at the age of ten. According to M. G. Weaver, the Mennonite historian of Lancaster county, Mellinger was ordained deacon in what was then called the "Lampeter" Congregation, about 1790. He lived the greater part of his life on the old Bare homestead adjoining the church grounds, having married a granddaughter of the pioneer bishop, Martin Bare, one of the first ministers of the congregation. He played a prominent part in church affairs as well as in the general community life, and in the course of time the name of the congregation was changed to "Mellinger's," thus perpetuating his memory. He was closely associated with the noted Bishop Peter Eby, having traveled much with him in church work, as his correspondence clearly shows. According to M. G. Weaver, he died October 28, 1842, at the ripe old age of 89 years. His correspondence reveals him as a man of deep piety, unbounded devotion to the work of the church and the faith he had espoused, of thorough integrity, generous and kind-hearted, of unusual wisdom and intelligence, loved and trusted by all, and the counsellor of countless friends in both spiritual and temporal matters, a pillar and adornment of his faith and church.

The letters which are here presented have been preserved to-

gether with many other letters and documents, by the descendants of Johannes Weber, who was a son of the noted German Mennonite preacher, Peter Weber, of Kindenheim in the Palatinate, and are now in the possession of the family Schmitt-Weber in Worms, Germany, Heinrichstrasse 5. Bishop Dr. Christian Neff, the South German Mennonite leader and historian, has been studying the mass of Weber material, and described the find of the Lancaster county Mellinger letters to the writer in the summer of 1929 on the occasion of a visit at the home of Bishop Neff in the parsonage at Weierhof, Palatinate, not far from Worms. He kindly consented to have the Mellinger letters copied and agreed to their publication in the REVIEW. We are indebted to the family Schmitt-Weber of Worms for kind permission to publish the letters, the originals of which are still in their possession.

The Mellinger letters by no means exhaust the value of the Schmitt-Weber collection for Mennonite history, nor even for American Mennonite history. Particularly is this true of the correspondence of preacher Peter Weber, who died in 1781. A find of unusual value, is a very early, probably contemporary copy in German of the letter from Pennsylvania in 1771 to Holland, which was published in English translation in the October, 1929 issue of the REVIEW. The German copy necessitates a few corrections in the letter as published. Dr. Neff published this German copy in the *Mennonitische Gemeinde-Kalender* for 1929 (Kaiserslautern, Rheinphalz, Germany) of which he is editor. Another valuable set of documents in the Weber collection, also published by Dr. Neff in the *Kalender* for 1929, is a series of letters on the Amish division of 1694ff, which promise to be the ultimate authority on the history of the division. The REVIEW expects to publish these documents in English translation at a later date.

Since much of the material in the Mellinger letters consists of personal or family matters, the editor has chosen to omit large sections, and even entire letters, publishing only what is of historical importance.

I

July 31, 1807.

Dear Brother-in-Law:[1]

Yesterday friend Christian Wenger came and brought this brief letter written by his wife, your dear cousin, since I had written to him

---

1 Johannes Weber, of Kindenheim, in the Palatinate, Germany. His wife was Charlotte, sister of Martin Mellinger. See the introductory note for further information about Johannes Weber.

that he should write you how it was going with them and who of them was still living. It was a great joy for them to hear from you, especially for your dear cousin. They live 35 English miles from here, and to-day noon he had to leave again for the return journey. He said that if his wife had not just adopted a little orphan she would have come along. And he said he was sure that if he should tell her that her cousin Johannes Weber was here, she would start out at once to come to us. It is a wonder that I did not learn to know them earlier, since 9 or 10 years ago, when I was passing through that vicinity with other fellow-ministers including his father, we spent the night with one of his cousins, and since then I have also been with his cousin several times with visiting ministers. If I pass through the vicinity again I will certainly stop there and pay them an affectionate visit. Your cousin E. W. also manifested love toward me and asked me to remember him with love and many thanks to you from himself and family.

Further I must say that we are all greatly indebted to God for His mercy to us in soul and body. We have had a moderately good harvest with good harvest weather, and are just now hauling in the oats, which has produced quite well. The corn also looks good.

But just now a dark cloud has arisen over America, which has produced fear in many hearts, and in others great joy. It is the threat of war with England.[2] The President has ordered that no English vessel may land at our harbors, and that no meat or provisions dare be sold to them. Whoever is guilty of selling anything to them is to be punished, all because the English fired on an American ship and according to the report killed 3 and wounded 20. Nevertheless many hope and trust that this war-cloud will pass by, and the Lord will save us from disaster.

I just wanted to use this brief time to write you. I commend all of you to the keeping and guiding of God, dear brother-in-law, sister, friends and acquaintances.

Martin Möllinger.

[The following letter by Maria Weber Wenger, cousin of Johannes Weber, was enclosed in the envelope with the previous letter.]

I received your letter on the 19th of July from our dear friend Martin Möllinger. I was so glad that I could weep for joy that my dear cousin Johannes Weber still remembers me and mine. As far as we are concerned, we are all well, and have 8 children, 5 sons and 3 daughters. Two sons and a daughter are married. The Lord has blessed us richly in temporal goods. And I desire that the heavenly

---

[2] The war of 1812 with Great Britain was in the offing. The naval incident referred to was the famous Leopand-Chesapeake affair of June, 1807. As early as November, 1806, Congress had passed a non-importation act, closing the American market to certain British goods, as a means of coercing the European belligerents. Although this act was never effectively enforced, it was followed in December, 1807, by the Embargo Act, which ordered the closing of American harbors to all foreign trade.

and eternal blessing may be richly increased in all our hearts from now on and forever. So I wish in closing to you and all the dear friends in Germany, especially to my dear cousin, Johannes Weber and family, a hearty greeting of love. I suppose we shall never see each other again on this side of eternity, but it is my sincere wish that we may see each other in the land of eternal bliss and joy. My mother died in the year 1800 and my father died last year also. So much from me, Maria Wenger, nee Weber, still living where we were.

II

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
August 7, 1807.

Dear Brother-in-law and Sister:

[A lengthy letter full of personal details in which the writer reports that the previous letter was being taken to Germany by a certain Graf or Gross of Neuwied. This letter is being taken by a certain friend Peter Ulrich, a prominent "Neulaender," or land agent who traveled much between Germany and the United States, and who appears very frequently in Mellinger's letters as a friend and intermediary. Mellinger mentions a funeral which he had attended the previous day and then continues in his characteristic vein.]

May the Lord grant us all grace to think of our future end. . . . Dear brother-in-law, I notice in your letters that possibly your Peter and the children of Brother Jacob Neff desire to come to America, concerning which, dear brother and sister, I already wrote you my opinion in the letter I sent you this spring with friend Gross. Or perhaps they are already on the way. If so may God accompany them and us wherever we are, for we need his protection very much. I have often been urged to write letters for others and advise their friends and remind them that there is still much land here to be had, and cheap. But I have never felt justified in doing so. It is true that many families improve their lot outwardly, but many others have lost out in other respects since they settle somewhere according to their own fancy where there is no church of any sort, and where the Gospel is not preached. . . .

Martin Möllinger.

III

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
November 9, 1813.

Dearly beloved Brother-in-law and Sister:

We must confess with Samuel, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us, the name of the Lord be praised." I learn through a letter from a brother who lives 60 miles from here, that friend Peter Ulrich[1] has told him that he intends to return to Germany and will stop with me on the 10th or 11th of the month, and that I should try to be at

1 Peter Ulrich's name often appears in the Mellinger letters. Ulrich was a "Neulaender," or land agent, whose occupation was promoting immigration from Germany to America. These agents often served as letter-carriers and business intermediaries between friends in Germany and America.

home when he comes. But I am sorry that I can probably not see him since I would gladly have spoken with him in person before he leaves. I promised one of our ministers that I would go with him on the 11th of the month on a tour of the churches from 60 to 80 miles from here to conduct communion services, since he does not know the way and I do, and I can hardly refuse him. So I wish the angel of the Lord may accompany friend P. Ulrich on his way over and back, the Lord willing. Baptism and communion service can be conducted by our bishops only.

I received your kind letter of the 11th of June, 1810 through friend P. Ulrich on the 8th of March, 1811, together with the 3 books, and answered it on the 22nd of March with an enclosure for cousin Jacob Mellinger, but it seems that it did not get away since friend P. U. received no mail during the time that he was here. Your letter of April 10, 1808, was also received through P. U. and answered and sent to Philadelphia (like the letters to the Möllinger friends), and addressed to P. U. at Waldorf, but it seems to have been lost also. All of us, my wife and family, together with sister Marie and brother Jacob, are well and happy outwardly for which may the Lord receive praise, honor and thanksgiving. But, as everyone knows who has reached an advanced age, the natural forces tend to abate. If then it were as the Apostle says, that the outer man declines while the inner man grows from day to day, this would be no loss. My wife's hearing grows worse instead of better. Marie still lives in the house belonging to the church[2] as before, and Jacob lives in the distilling-house. There is little else to write, except that we live in peace together, at least outwardly. When friend P. U. successfully completes his journey and reaches you again he can tell you about our friends in detail personally. On account of the unrest and war[3] he was compelled to remain here a year longer than he had intended. For that reason we hoped he could stay with us a week or more but he never stayed with us longer than a night or a day and a night, since his business would not permit him to stay longer. He is so widely known in America that if he should stay another year, he would be no more ready to leave. I am sorry that he often has such a hard time especially with Mrs. Rupp[4] in Lancaster. I do not know whether he will secure complete payment from her before he leaves or not. I would not like to have all the work for the money which she now has to pay. The husband had claimed to have a thousand pounds inheritance fifteen years ago, but now her share turns out to be something over 700 pounds, and what Ulrich has to pay out of the half of the 700 I do not know. Ulrich is innocent. He tried the best he could peacefully to arrange matters but she refused and so he had to become strict. Then the Lawyers want to share in the inheritance too.

---

[2] The house belonging to the Church was formerly a schoolhouse, as is stated elsewhere in the letters.

[3] The war of 1812 with Great Britain.

[4] Ulrich apparently was an agent for Mrs. Rupp in arranging for the settlement of an estate in Germany in which her deceased husband was to share.

Dear brother-in-law and sister. I understand the worry and anxiety which you face in connection with what has befallen your Peter and we are ready to help you out with 1500 gulden in exchange. 600 gulden are already in Peter Weber's hand, if his inheritance which he is to receive amounts to so much, more or less, and he is to pay it as he proposes in his letter, namely his guardian is to pay it to you and take a note with interest until he sends him a receipt for the same.

Also friend Heinrich Strohm is ready to turn over to you a debt which his brother Johannes Strohm of Kriegsheim owes, if it does not press him too hard, namely 411 gulden. Further, I have loaned Brother Heinrich Rupp about 315 gulden on March 18, 1812, and he still has his inheritance with you. He lives beyond the Susquehanna in East Benberry (?) township in Cumberland County, and is, if I mistake not, a nephew of the here deceased Jacob Rupp (Schwestersohn). He needed some money last year to build a barn. He is a preacher in our church, called through the lot a few years ago, and is a faithful servant in his calling. I will visit him on the 12th of this month, and he will probably write you, if the letter can be sent later. The safest way to send money is by exchange. Friend Ulrich will probably travel your way.

I often wonder how things are going with you, and who is still living. No doubt you have thought much of us during the past years, and wondered how things were going with us during the war[3] which we have been having in our land, or Pennsylvania. We have reason to thank God, since thus far none of us has been called to the militia, and since we have not had to furnish any money except the regular taxes, and in addition have had very good harvests for the past several years, and almost everything is bringing a good price. At the present time a farm can be bought in our neighborhood, that is from 100 to 150 acres, for 50 to 80 pounds per acre and higher. Smaller farms are sold for higher prices. Last year whiskey was sold from the house for 3 shillings a gallon and more. Recently the price went up 5 or 6 cents. Rye brings 8 shillings and 6 cents a bushel, corn 7 shillings and six cents, wheat 11 shillings and 3 cents. But now taxes are being placed on various things. The older countries know long since that war is expensive.

Most Americans have not yet experienced anything of the war. But those who live on the borders and in Canada, where the real occasion for the war is as well as the fighting, have unfortunately experienced much, and have learned to know how precious peace is. For a number of years very many of our acquaintances among our people have been moving to Canada in English or Royal territory.[5] So far we have not heard that any of those who confess the nonresistant faith have been compelled by the King to take up arms, but as long as the war lasts each one is compelled to pay 21 Spanish

---

[5] Mennonites from Lancaster County began to settle in what is now Waterloo County, Ontario, as early as 1799. For a document showing that Mennonites in this region were impressed into quartermaster service in the War in 1813 see the *Review* for October, 1929, article "New Sources for Ontario Mennonite History."

Taler each year, and in time of peace 4 Taler, on condition of which they are not to be disturbed in war time. We do not know what may yet come but we hope for the best.

On the 27th of last October, a man stopped with me over night who was collecting money to aid the Mennonites who had been plundered by the Indians. He, Joseph Miller, claims that in the year 1810, 40 families of Mennonites from Germany, all from the same district, 4 hours from Kaiserslautern and 7 hours from Zweibrücken, emigrated to America taking their preachers with them, namely Jacob Kaufman and Christian Hirschmann. The three preachers and the group together came to Richmond in Virginia, and then went on further to Tennessee, about 600 miles from Lancaster County, where they settled together in the wilderness. In August of this year the Indians stormed Fort Tennessee, and drove the settlers, about 80 Mennonite families, back into the settled country. It is true that the Indians, due to the intrigues of the English, captured the fort and destroyed everything they could lay hands on, for this we have read in the newspapers. But since neither I nor anyone else had ever heard of such a settlement from Germany in this region, and no one believed his story, we sent the man away with about 100 Spanish Taler until we should have more definite information. It is without doubt true that at this time there are many people living along the border who have to suffer much. If we are permitted by the Lord to continue our correspondence, I should be glad to know from you whether anyone from the above-mentioned region knows anything about such an emigration, or ever heard anything about it.[6]

I also wish to let you know that I received the books, namely *Theorie der Geisterkunde* (which is often 60 miles away), *Siegesgeschichte* and *Nachtrag*. I have never held much of strange books, but in the year 1810 Stilling's[7] *Heimweh* fell into my hands--I had bought it from the Moravians. Many a time I said to myself, "Stilling, what is your goal." I was also able to buy his *Geisterscene*[8]. His *Lebenslauf* has been printed here, and that I have too. I have also read *Theobald oder die Schwaermer und Florentin*. Just as I was finishing, in came friend Ulrich with the *Geschichtsbücher* from you. I have not been able to learn whether *Der Graue Mann* is to be bought here or not, but now I have had it for 5 weeks in my house. I also have *Der Menschenfreund*. I would like to read all of Stilling's books, especially those that deal with the religion of Jesus, if you could send them to me. The *Siegesgeschichte* is also being printed here now. I well know the words of Solomon where he says, "Fear God and keep his commandments," and this is my heart's desire. Greet all those who read this letter, with the wish that we may together enter into

---

[6] There is no historical evidence of a Mennonite settlement in Tennessee as suggested here. The story was evidently a fraudulent scheme to secure money.

[7] Heinrich Jung Stilling, a prominent scholar and writer, for a time Professor at Heidelberg, was a great friend of the Palatinate Mennonites. He wrote a biography of Menno Simons. All the books mentioned in the letter have Stilling for their author. See also the two following letters.

[8] The proper title is *Scenen aus dem Geisterreich.*

the heavenly rest. Finally, we greet you all, dear brother-in-law, dear sister, and all your dear children, friends, brethren and sisters, ministers and elders, from myself and wife and our family including Marie and Jacob.

So much from your old simple-hearted and sincere brother-in-law, friend and brother, Martin Möllinger.

IV

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
May 3, 1814

Dear Brother-in-law Johannes Weber and dear Sister Weber:

I have recently learned that friend P. Ulrich is still prevented from entering upon his journey on account of the unfortunate war, and for this reason has not yet been able to secure a guaranteed boat for the passage, but I learned that he hoped to be able to sail in May of this year. So I thought I would try, out of love for you, to see whether I could still catch him with a letter for you, and let you know that we are getting along well here under our dear Father's hand, for which we cannot render him enough praise and thanks. We must recognize that the Father's great blessing with which he has blessed us Americans perhaps may become a "cloke of maliciousness" ("Deckel der Bosheit," I Peter 2:16). For this reason perhaps our loving Father had to use the chastisement of love for his dearly purchased children on account of their sin and transgression. If we draw near unto him he will draw near unto us and be found of us. But the prodigal son even had to go so far as to do without the husks before he came to himself and returned to his father.

Since I wrote you my last letter, also the letter to the Mellingers, a number of deaths have again taken place in our neighborhood, by which many of my acquaintances were suddenly called away. Solomon says in the Proverbs, "Speak to wisdom and wisdom will answer you, etc." Dear brother-in-law and sister, you and yours are probably wondering how many of us are still alive and how we are getting along in this time of war. We have often wondered the same about you. But we can give you no further word except what you can read in the newspaper, just as we also must learn of affairs in your region and other distant lands through the papers. The army is quite a distance from us. Although disquiet and fear is over the whole land, still no doubt there is more suffering and anxiety across the sea, as you yourselves have doubtless experienced. The Lord will finally help those who trust on him in patience and hope.

Dear brother-in-law, I had written to you to send me some of H. Stilling's books when you have opportunity, especially those which I do not have. I have Stilling's *Lebenslauf, Heimweh, Scenen aus dem Geisterreich, Der Menschenfreund, Theobald oder die Schwärmer,* and the ones you sent me. Further I have read, *Florentin von Fahlendorn, Herr von Morgenthau,* and parts of *Der Graue Mann,* but not all parts of the latter are to be had here. Do not trouble yourself, but if you have a good opportunity to send his writings with the entire *Graue Mann* which we do not yet have here, I should appreciate it. But our time is short, only today, yea only this hour, and not tomorrow or the years to come.

from myself, my wife, Marie, Jacob, and my stepson Abraham Denlinger

Hearty greetings to all of you with your children without exception

and his wife Anna. Remember us when it goes well with you, and we shall do the same.

So much from your humble friend, brother and brother-in-law,
Martin Möllinger.

V

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
February 26, 1816

Dear Brother-in-law:

Your very welcome letter of March 7, 1815, together with H. Stilling's writings we received on the 7th of November through friend P. U. We are so glad to receive a letter! how glad we shall be to see and speak together personally! But since this is scarcely to be expected, I rejoice every now and then at the thought of the happy meeting in eternity, of which Jesus speaks to his disciples in John 16:16 and 22. I greet you all from the heart with this same greeting for you and your children. Dear brother-in-law and sister, we owe it alone to his eternal wisdom that we have been spared so kindly to this hour above many other thousands, and that we have been cared for by his longsuffering.

Friend P. Ulrich deserves our thanks for having been our servant all these years. We do not envy him the 20 ocean trips which he has made, and hope that the Lord may grant him the good fortune of being able to make his 21st journey in safety and soon return to us again. I would have written sooner but I was waiting for letters from Heinrich Strohm and Johannes Weber, to the joy of their relatives. These came with a receipt from Johannes Weber for his entire property from father and grandfather for 972 gulden and 41 kreuzer. The 125 gulden of Heinrich Strohm which was owing to me is to be reckoned with interest from August 15, 1815 and paid. And what is still short of the 1500 gulden is to be made up as you direct.

The writings of Stilling which you sent me are still passing about from hand to hand. I was glad to receive *Theodora von der Linden, Erzaehlungen ueber das Neue Testament,* and *Taschenbuch fuer Freunde des Christentums.*

I was glad to learn from your letter that Stilling is still writing. But just now I see by the paper that he has died. He had many friends in America who will mourn his passing. He sowed much good seed and now he will harvest the good that he sought in his earthly life. I desire from the heart the happiness of the Hebrews that many may be brought to Christ, for they have the promise which will also be fulfilled. Finally Joseph will reveal himself to his brethren and then joy and fear will struggle with each other. He who says, "I will be with you to the end of the world," who was and still is, spared Peter from death and broke the weapon in his martyr-hand. It is a great comfort to us, for who knows what is still before us, the future is dark, and we can well say, "Darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the peoples." But we know on whom we should believe, yea on Him who has said, "All power on heaven and earth is given unto me."

Dear brother-in-law, you ask me to write you how old each of us is and how old Charlotta[1] is too. When I think of my age and try to reckon it out, I have to reckon thus: when my mother died I was about 10 years old. Ten years we were in Monsheim, Marie and I. In 1772 we come to this country. Accordingly I would be 64, Marie 66, Jacob 62, and Benedict, if he were living, would be 60. But this is only approximately. You have Charlotta's age better than we have ours. The old deceased cousin Wilhelm Schumacher was married to our mother's sister Marie, and she is still living. They came to this country one year before we did. He often told me of a beautiful old Bible which our father had in which all our names were written, and which Marie and I can remember quite well. But since everything was sold by Charlotta's mother after father's death, no one knows where the Bible got to.

[The letter contains several additional paragraphs full of family affairs.]

Dear ones, what more should I write? Often I have to think of the fear which came over us in the recent war with England, and suddenly, just when sword was against sword, and things were at their worst, unexpectedly the express post carried news of peace everywhere.[2] What joy that brought only those can understand who have suffered for years under the burden of armies. Often I have to think of my native land, of my friends and acquaintances, most of whom have died of grief and tribulation, and of those who are still living who have to continue suffering through the years with debts and difficulties.[3] O, if we could only be thankful enough toward Him who has our fate in His hands! O, could we Americans only learn to use for the peace of our souls, this peace and quiet that comes to us because no enemy can disturb us! O, if we could only as Americans boast that we need to fear the world and the flesh as little as we need to fear our enemies from without, then we should already be in "Sollima"[?]. But alas, the mercy of God is forgotten so quickly in these free days, and it is almost with us as it was with the children of Israel when the Lord had led them out with His strong hand, had drowned their enemies before their eyes, and had supported them in the wilderness, and yet they murmured against God and Moses. Johannes Hartmetz and wife and one child are still living, the two first children are dead, and he himself has been sickly for several years, so that his business affairs are not prospering very much, or are nothing. The dear brother and co-laborer preacher Henry Rupp is still well. . . .

So much from your humble, sincere brother-in-law,

Martin Möllinger.

---

1 Charlotta was Johannes Weber's wife, sister of Martin Mellinger.

2 The War of 1812 was suddenly terminated in June, 1815.

3 The writer refers to the effects of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe on his Palatinate friends and relatives.

VI

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
July 1, 1816.

Dearly beloved Brother-in-law and Sister Weber:

[This letter is full of personalia of little general interest. Mellinger mentions receipt of Weber's letters of May 7, 1815 and February 1, 1816, the latter of which he had received on the day of writing, together with letters from Weber's son-in-law Johann Risser, and Cousin Barbara Möllinger.

Of interest is a short letter addressed to his sister, Charlotta, Mrs. Weber, who had complained that their sister Marie had to live in a house by herself. Mellinger replies that she wished to live alone and was living in "a schoolhouse which is beside the church house where people are always living, and which is only 200 steps" from his house. Mellinger also mentions that "we gave up distilling whiskey last spring" (Branntweinbrennen)].

VII

[It seems that a few of Weber's letters to Mellinger have been preserved in the form of copies in the Weber collection. Two have been found, one dated May 4, 1817, and one September 20, 1823. We present some extracts from the first letter here since they are of general interest.]

Kindenheim, May 4, 1817

Dear Brothers-in-law and Sisters-in-law:

Since I now have the best opportunity to send you a letter through friend Peter Ulrich who is now about to start his 11th journey to America, I send you this letter

* * * * * *

The report you mentioned in your letter of February 26 that Jung Stilling[1] had died was unfounded, for he was at Monsheim and Pfeddersheim last year for Pentecost. His son had been with David Möllinger[2] at Pfeddersheim for several years. I saw Stilling personally at the last place and spoke with him, but he was so weak that I was not allowed to be with him for more than a half hour. Since then he has been very weak and finally died on April 2, last. He was an unusual man and accomplished much good especially among the upper classes. . . .

[Weber then reports at great length the extraordinary shortage of food and fodder, due to the unusual weather of the previous year with heavy floods in the Rhine district and in Holland. The prices are so high that it is almost impossible to buy, and many small states were forbidding the export of food with heavy fines. Especially in Württemberg and the French territory, he says, the need was indescribable. Many people were suffering famine. An interesting note refers to a Mennonite soldier in Napoleon's army, a young son of Heinrich Schneider who had to go along on the Russian campaign, and never returned. A final paragraph refers to a package of books which he was sending to Mellinger as follows:]

In one package, dear Brother, I send you the following books: Stilling's *Theodore von der Linden,* 2 volumes; *Der Graue Mann,* 30

---

[1] Cf. letter No. V.

[2] David Möllinger was a very noted Mennonite farmer. An interesting discussion of his contribution to scientific agriculture will be found in Ernst Correll's *"Das Schweizerische Täufer—Mennonitentum,"* pp. 122ff.

copies in five volumes; *Taschenbuch fuer* 1816; *Biblische Erzaehlungen,* 2 pamphlets and a conclusion. Further a *Schatzkaestlein* and *Erzaehlungen von Stilling,* also a portrait of Stilling. Under the 24th of May I sent you also *Stillings Antwort auf Sulzers Briefe, etc.*

VIII

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
February 29, 1820

Dearly beloved Brother-in-law and Sister Weber:

[Among other personalia the letter reports the receipt of letters of January 30, 1819, May 9, 1819, and August 3, 1819, the latter received through Jacob Lichti, Johannes Beutler,[1] and Jacob Bally, three youths who had just come over looking for work. Mellinger tells how he helped them find work and then proceeds as follows:]

Further I could not help them since I had to leave on Monday morning, the 15th, on a three weeks trip. So on the 15th I set out with my comrade Peter Eby[2], and each of the three went to his place of work where he still is. On our trip as far as Tschembaestown[3], Brother Peter Eby conducted communion services in seven churches, baptized in four places and received expelled members, and ordained one preacher by the lot. On the third of December we reached home again safe and sound.

[The remainder of the letter is filled with personalia, and a passing mention of his grief at hearing of the troubles in the church at Kriegsheim. He also mentions that Brother Jacob Neff with his two sons-in-law and the wives had moved 40 miles back in Westmoreland County to Jacobs Creek where they were content. It is not clear whether Neff was a preacher although he is called a "Mitarbeiter."]

* * * * * *

IX

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
February 20, 1821

Dearly beloved Brother-in-law and Sister Weber:

It has pleased our almighty God and Father to spare us to this hour, and in his mercy to care, protect and watch over us like a hen watches over her chickens under her wings. Whereof we have reason to say with our whole heart as the prophet David says; "Bless the Lord, O My Soul and all my heart and tongue, and forget not what God hath done for me in my whole life until now, and protected me from all danger."

---

1 Beutler later settled in Perry County, Ohio. A son, Jacob Beutler, was bishop in the Yellow Creek Mennonite Church, Elkhart County, Indiana, 1872 to 1884.

2 Peter Eby of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, was the most noted Mennonite Bishop of the United States in his day. He was ordained as bishop in 1804, and died in 1843. An equally noted younger brother was Bishop Benjamin Eby of Waterloo County, Ontario.

3 Chambersburg, Franklin County.

Your letter of September 15, 1820 and Jan. 17, 1821, together with cousin Barbara Möllinger's letter and the 9 copies of the *Magazine of the Evangelical Mission and Bible Society* and the *Mannheimer Wochenblatt* of August 1st, we received through friend P. Ulrich by the hand of Finkenauer. Finkenauer remained here over night and since then I have not seen him. On the 29th of September he wrote me a few lines from Lancaster to let me know that he expected to sail from Baltimore on the 20th of October for Bremen, and would come our way in 14 days to fetch the letters and whatever else I had for him to do. So I did not want to waste this opportunity and will send you black paper, since you can read the white paper as little as I. If my letters are as welcome to you as yours to me, it will not be a burden for the Webers.

I know I have made you trouble for years with sending you letters to be forwarded to other people, but I cannot help myself and have had to be a servant for several years now for the Swiss Brethren who came over to us, and now you will have to be their servant too. This summer another group of six families of the same brotherhood from the neighborhood of Basel came over and again brought their wagons with them from Switzerland, with which they had traveled through France and landed in New York. The last group brought a bishop with them and went at once, almost without stopping, to Wooster in Ohio where the other Swiss have settled.[1] I have already received news from them that they are well-pleased, and it is easy to foresee that if conditions remain as they are now, many others will come over out of the same neighborhood. And now I am to take care of their letters from here to Switzerland and from Switzerland here. And now what am I to do? If you knew what the many sick in the neighborhood whom I ought to visit are thinking of me, you would have patience with my writing. This time it was a request to make a trip through York County, Macalister, into Maryland as far as 12 miles above Hagerstown and back again to Chambersburg and through Cumberland, to visit the churches. I just wanted to tell you this so that you might see, that I am not slothful and often do not know where I am at home.

On the 17th of August I left home with Bishop Peter Eby,[2] to attend a communion service and reinstatement of two members on the 18th, communion and baptism on the 19th, baptism and communion on the 21st at Macalister, 23rd and 24th preaching services, 26th baptism 12 miles above Hagerstown, receiving a member and communion, 27th preaching at Greencastle, 29th preaching at Chambersburg and ordination of a bishop by lot, 31st services at Strassburg, September 2, communion at Ruwehl [?] in Cumberland, services on the 4th with instruction of 12 candidates for church membership. On the 5th on

---

[1] The Swiss Mennonite settlement referred to is that founded in Wayne County, Ohio, in 1817, southeast of Wooster, known as the Sonnenberg settlement. The bishop mentioned was probably Peter Lehman, who died in 1842.

[2] Apparently Mellinger was frequently the traveling companion and counsellor of Bishop Eby.

the return journey we learned of the burial of one of our preachers 2 miles from Lancaster, 55 years of age, whose sorrowing widow and 8 children I visited on the way home. His name was Jacob Mayer, a gifted speaker and beloved. On the 6th toward evening I reached home and found my loved ones as well as I had left them. On the 7th I had to leave again but came home in the evening. On the 8th I visited the sick again, some who had inquired of me even before I had come home, and wished me to come to see them. There were and are still many sick with colds, fever, and dysentery, so that I was unable to reach home before the 11th in the evening. That meant that September 12th was the first time since August 17th that I was able to eat dinner at home. So we spent three weeks on the trip, and at the beginning found it so warm and often bad water, and almost every morning met so many sick with fever and dysentery so that in many families all were sick and no one could help the other.

* * * * * *

With us thus far it has always been the case that there are brethren who are willing to serve the Lord and go into the lot by election. I am quite widely acquainted in our vicinity where I have attended forty to fifty meetings (congregations) and I have never heard that any of our preachers wanted a salary, thank God.[3] The Lord has called home many a faithful servant so that I and many others have thought, what a loss! But the Lord has always provided and will continue to provide faithful workers when we ask Him. Dear brother-in-law, I write thus because of your letter. My heart says yea and amen to the text which you quoted at the end of the second page in your letter; "Repent and believe the gospel." Faith in Jesus is nothing else than to keep His commandments, and to keep His commandments is to say as Isaiah said, Isa. 6:4, "Here am I." To be sure, something else must take place before a man can say, "Send me," as we can see from the 1st to 8th verse of the same chapter.

[The remainder of the letter is filled with personalia. It might be noted that John Kreider is mentioned as a minister (Diener) in Mellinger's congregation.]

X

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
February 20, 1821

Dearly beloved Brother-in-law and Sister Weber:

[The first half of the letter consists of personalia.]

I thought I would not write much this time, but since you will probably have read through the old letters, and since you like to read written and printed material, I am sending my dear sister Charlotta Weber one of

3 There was a tendency among the German Mennonite churches in the Palatinate to introduce paid pastors in place of the traditional Mennonite custom of choosing preachers by lot who served without pay.

our last hymnbooks.[1] We had it printed for the first time in the year 1804 and the second time in the year 1808. Now again in the third edition as before we are printing 4,000 copies and they are selling so fast as they are bound, and we expect that there will be none left over or there may even not be enough. Thus you can see that the Mennonites are strong in number.

And now I want to tell you how it went when the first book was to be printed. Since we had all sorts of hymnbooks, the old Swiss songbooks[2] and Reformed[3] hymnbooks, and not enough of what we had, our brethren decided to have a hymnbook printed for ourselves. Brethren and choristers were to select beautiful and fitting hymns, after which they were to be collected and given over to 3, 4, or 5 men. These men were to select enough out of the hymns which had been collected so that the hymnbook would not be too large. After a time two Skippack[4] brethren came together with two of our leading bishops in my house to examine the hymns which had been collected. The Skippack brethren, since they have a large and strong church as well as a large district and are well-trained in singing, had brought together enough hymns for a complete hymnbook and had 3,000 subscriptions in advance. We also had many hymns from Virginia[5], from Jacob's Creek[6], and from our vicinity, which were to go into the book. So it was feared that the book would become too large. In addition our brethren wanted to include a number of psalms and notes. In short, the difference was so great that the Skippack brethren said that their hymns had been handed in by so many brethren and dared not be omitted, and so many had already subscribed, and there was a lengthy discussion. The second day the Skippack brethren said that they were only delegates, and they saw no other way than to have their book printed in Germantown[7] where they had a good printer and bookbinder, which was so handy for them that they could look after everything, and we could print ours in Lancaster. And so the outcome was that they had as many printed as we. But that made no difference to us or them, for we love one another, and we visit them and they visit us every year. And still

---

1 *Unparteyisches Gesangbuch,* Lancaster, Pa., 1804.

2 The *Ausbund,* first edition 1564, was the ancient and only Swiss Mennonite hymnbook. It was reprinted in Germantown, Pa. 1742, 1751, 1767, 1785, 1815 and many times later in Lancaster and elsewhere. Apparently it was not in universal use in Lancaster Mennonitism and was easily supplanted.

3 The Reformed hymnbook referred to was probably Ambrosii Lobwasser's *Neu vermehrtes Gesangbuch,* published for the first time at Germantown in 1753, and again at the same place in 1763. The writer found a number of copies of the second edition at the Groffdale Church in Lancaster county.

4 "Skippack" refers to what is now called the "Franconia" Conference District, composed of churches chiefly in Bucks and Montgomery Counties in Pennsylvania.

5 A considerable Mennonite settlement was early established in the Shenandoah Valley in Virginia, the first settler coming probably as early as 1728.

6 Jacobs' Creek was the name of the Mennonite settlement in Westmoreland Co., in southwestern Pennsylvania, in the vicinity of what is now Scottdale. The settlement dates its origin at least as early as 1804.

7 The "Skippack" hymnbook was first issued in 1803 at Germantown by Michael Billmeyer with the title, *Die kleine geistliche Harfe.*

it is a pity that it had to be so. For many years already, many families have been moving to Virginia, Jacob's Creek[6], and Canada[8], and each has his hymnbook, and then they have different hymnbooks when they come together. Although you will doubtless know most of the hymns in the books, you will probably find many beautiful and valuable hymns, especially in the last appendix, which are strange to you and have never yet appeared in print.

* * * * * *

Last fall we had a severe fever in our vicinity and for some distance around, of which many people died, but at the present time most are well. January was cold and had much snow, while this month is mild and tolerable. Last year we had a very warm and dry summer but the crops as well as the fodder and fruit were plentiful and practically all the necessities of life are to be had in abundance and cheap. And as we read in the papers it must be so with you also. A bushel of wheat costs 3 shillings and 9 cents, rye and corn 3 shillings. Money has become scarce, and places that are at some distance from markets can scarcely get any money at all, so that the crops cannot be sold for money. During the many years that Germany was suffering from the effects of war[9] and thousands died on account of it, America was able to sell almost everything for high prices, and an insatiable spirit seized the land and people could not get enough land to buy, as a result of which the prices went up tremendously, for both buildings and farms as well. In the last years however prices dropped just as severely as they rose, and it is unbelievable how many of those who were supposed to be among the wealthiest have come to nothing and have had to sell everything, while others have lost 1,000, 10,000, and 500,000 dollars, and these are farmers with whom I am acquainted. Others who did not speculate loaned money to those who did, and now they have lost their money. But Providence knows what is best. I know of a number who had to sell their farms to pay debts and did not receive as much for them as the houses had cost. I thought to myself, if only the good people had read and obeyed the beautiful hymn number 2 in the appendix, "O, hear the sweet . . . ."

So much from your indebted and loving friend and brother,

Martin Möllinger.

XI

[A letter dated May 25, 1822, containing only personalia.]

XII

[A long letter dated September 5, 1822, containing only personalia. The death of Mellinger's sister Marie is described. Peter Eby preached the funeral sermon using Revelation 14:13, from which "he preached a moving sermon." Marie left 200 dollars for the poor in her will. A number of "Neuländer" are

---

8 Families from Bucks and Montgomery counties from the "Skippack" district began moving to Lincoln County, Ontario, as early as 1799 and possibly 1786. The emigrants from Lancaster settled chiefly in Waterloo County, with some in York County.

9 The Napoleonic Wars.

mentioned who had gotten into trouble, a Finkenauer and a Hütwohl, and Mellinger says, "The Neuländer are beginning to attack one another." Mention is also made of the arrival of a number of young Swiss immigrants.]

XIII

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
December 1, 1822

Dearly beloved Brother-in-Law and Sister in the Lord:

* * * * * *

On the 8th of November I had to leave again with Brother P. Eby on a journey where most of the places were arranged at which we were to stop. This time we did not follow quite the same route as we did 15 months before, but we visited some of the same congregations. Dear brother-in-law, you say in your letter that you cannot understand how I can still make so many and such long trips, and I will say that I have never made a really long trip. Last summer two of our ministers, Samuel Nüssly a bishop, and Christian Nüssly, both made a visit to Canada, for which they required seven weeks and two days, and on which they often had to go 11, 12, or 13 miles until they got back to where they were staying. The latter had been there four or five years before, and just recently this fall another one of our bishops with several lay brethren made the trip, but required only 5 weeks and a day for the journey. At the present time the road to Canada is much in use, and a large number are emigrating thither. Under the king the nonresistant people have full freedom of conscience, so that they do not need to take up arms in time of war. Those that have to pay the highest pay only 20 dollars a year, and those who are not so well-to-do pay less. And when there is no war, they pay only 1½ to 2 dollars yearly. In a sense they are better off than we are. But one who knows his Bible can read there as well as experience in our day, that even the greatest kings may be dethroned by another who is also dethroned, so that everything is uncertain and transient. But he who puts himself under the protection of the King of kings whose kingdom continues to all eternity, he indeed is happy and blessed.

In September I and P. Eby[1] made a visit in the Swatara[2] vicinity where, if I remember right, on the evening of the 21st of September we stayed overnight with your cousin Maria Wenger. . . . They are united, but not in a spiritual sense, since her husband joined the New Dunkards[3] (Neu Tunkers) who began about 40 years ago when her husband joined them. He had himself immersed and is one of their preachers. They teach that no other baptism is allowable except immersion, and believe that a fully new man arises out of the water. But she has remained true to the faith she had accepted. And yet, on account of her husband, I do not believe she takes communion. I asked her whether she did not go to

---

1 Cf. Letter VIII, Note 2.

2 The Swatara district is in Lebanon County.

3 By New Dunkards is meant very likely the "River Brethren," who were organized about 1780 chiefly from Mennonite elements in western Lancaster County along the Susquehanna River.

communion in his church since she often attended their meetings, but she said not. In this section it is like you said in your letter, "as in the book of Judges," since they have had no preacher for a long time, each one does as he thinks best, or perhaps it is because there are too many preachers and each one says, "Here is the temple of the Lord," whereby many unlearned are led astray.

* * * * * *

Remember us as we remember you,
Your loving brother,
Martin Möllinger.

XIV

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
March 14, 1823

Beloved Brother-in-law and Sister Weber:

* * * * * *

I wrote your son-in-law, Johannes Risser, last December that I had received your letters, and since I was just starting out on a journey of three weeks had taken his letter along to pass the time evenings. I had to leave it with a dear co-laborer, but soon received it again. I wanted to please his father, Christian Risser, who is his cousin and a faithful preacher, with his letter, and sent it to him before Christmas, since I thought he would write him something too. But since then I have heard and seen nothing of the brother or the letter, although I frequently meet brethren who tell me they had read my letter from Germany and learned that the little book by our John Herr[1] has already reached Germany. As I hear, the letter is passed from one to another and I suppose that by the time I get it, it will be so torn that much will be illegible.

Today, the 23rd, I am writing again. On the 17th George Freinst of Lancaster came to my house, a total stranger to me, and inquired of a letter from John Schwarz to Musselman which was to have been given me to read. Since Jacob Brubaker, a bishop, was at our house and I had to make a visit which lasted until the 19th, I was not able to be at home a single day in the entire week. Through Freinst I learned the whole story about J. H. and Finkenauer . . . . For a number of years the "Neuländer"[2] have fallen into such disrepute that each one tries to discredit the other, so that I fear for P. Ulrich when he returns from Germany that he may fall into prison again where he was once.

* * * * * *

You say that in my previous letter to Christian Risser I did not say a word about John Herr. However I had no intention of writing about him since both you and he are acquainted with *Theobald der Schwärmer,*

1 John Herr, founder of the Reformed Mennonite Church (1812) published as his first book in 1815 a little volume entitled *Der Wahre und Selige Weg,* published in Lancaster by Joseph Ehrenfried.

2 The "Neuländer" were land agents engaged in promoting emigration from Germany to the new world.

although if I am asked to give their history from the beginning to the present I can do so, since I know them well and they lived and took their start in our neighborhood.

The thing began 35 years ago already with the father of John Herr, Francis Herr, who was the beginner. He began to preach in his house, but he wanted to sit like Jesus in Matthew 5. Now and then he was asked to officiate at funerals and then he had to stand after all when he spoke at the grave. He had a number of families of followers but he had no baptism or communion so that no receiving or expelling of members was necessary. He was a brother in our congregation[3] (Gemeinde), and once received votes for preacher. On account of mistakes for which he was to have made confession he left the church. Then he sat down and wrote an article of seven sheets on the conduct of a Christian church, but did not put it to practice. After his death some of our brethren became friends of John Herr, for whom neither our church nor any other church was right. John Herr was not baptized himself, and also preached sitting and severely criticised the Mennonites. Then three of them went together. One was a brother Abram Landes of our congregation who had to baptize J. H. Then he (J. H.) had the right to baptize A. Landes and thereafter baptized others also, among them his brother-in-law, who had not been baptized before. So the thing began. J. H. became bishop, A. Landes preacher, and Abr. Gross, brother-in-law of J. H., deacon.

I had not intended to spoil paper and ink with this matter but now I must add a little more. The Moravian preacher Reinke is an aged and noted man in Lititz. I was riding through Lancaster one day when Matthew Zaun called to me and handed me an unsealed letter [from Reinke] for John Herr, which I was to take along. Reinke had said that I could read it if I wished and then send it on to John Herr sealed. Of course I was glad to take the letter, but when I had finished reading it I said to myself, Reinke, you will learn later the sort of spirit with which you have to deal. At that time it was already copied for publication,[4] which neither I nor Reinke knew. I send you herewith a copy to read. Reinke refers to two books because John Herr had had his book translated and published in English[5] also. When Matthew Zaun read Reinke's answer to J. H. he was so heated that he would not listen to Reinke or anyone else. I often say, when in company, that these people are for our good, for they point out our mistakes and that should make us careful and cautious. But if we look at their mistakes and by spreading them around make the evil still worse, then the enemy has won his point. I never intended to send one of these books so far, but since you have read two of J. H. and the one by Zaun, I thought it might be well for you to read Reinke's booklet[4] too.

I probably told you in my last letter that Neff and his wife moved the 40 miles back to Strohm's again where their two daughters are, and

---

[3] It is uncertain whether Mellinger means to say that Herr had been a member of the Mellinger congregation or simply of the Mennonite Church in the Lancaster district.

[4] The Reinke letter was published in 1819 in Lancaster as *Einige Worte Wohlgemeinter Rath an Johannes Herr.*

[5] *The True and Blessed Way,* Harrisburg, 1816.

that their two sons-in-law also expect to move back again. . . . On the 21st (March) I asked Brother Christel Risser at our conference[6] about the letter. He says it is still circulating.

* * * * * *

May the peace of God which passeth understanding preserve your and our heart and mind in Christ Jesus. So much from your old, loving, weak brother and fellow-pilgrim on the road to the blessed eternity,

Martin Möllinger.

XV

[A letter from Johannes Weber, Kindenheim to Martin Mellinger, dated September 20, 1823. Acknowledges receipt of the letter of Mellinger of March in which the matter of John Herr is discussed. Weber agrees with Mellinger in his judgment of the Herrites, and comments at length "zur Erbauung." Further material consists of personalia.]

XVI

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
March 3, 1825

Dear Brother-in-law and Sister Weber:

* * * * * *

It has come to the point that one almost has to say, even of our vaunted America, that integrity has vanished, truth has become very ill, humility is gone and justice has disappeared from our land, and nothing reigns but deceit, falsehood and treachery wherever one turns, nothing but hypocrisy. However, dear brother-in-law, I would not have you think that all is bad, even though many, and even many of our people get tangled up with the world so that many a one is carried in the current, whereby many a one has learned that he lacks the ointment (Augensalb), which so often at our conferences so earnestly and effectively has been presented as the Christian's duties. There our brethren earnestly present to the assembled gathering the commands and prohibitions of the Saviour and the Apostles, namely that whosoever is the friend of the world is the enemy of God. And, praise God, we still have many witnesses of the truth. In the 52 years since I am here the Lord has taken away many a strong and faithful servant to himself, of whom only one is living today, and he is old and weak and cannot even leave his house. I and many others have often thought, how useful this or that one would have been in our ministerial duties ("Haushaltung"), and what a loss we have to bear. But the allwise Father has always cared for us, and has filled the places again with men of insight who seek to help "keep house" and build on the rock and cornerstone Jesus Christ.

* * * * * *

With hearty greetings to all by the grace and power of God,

From your dear friend,

Martin Möllinger.

[An appendix of March 9, refers to Jacob Denlinger, his second wife's sister's son, whom he had reared, and who is now deacon in a congregation 8 miles distant.]

---

6 This is the oldest known reference to the Lancaster Mennonite Conference.

XVII

April 19, 1825

Dear Brother-in-law and Sister Weber:

* * * * * *

I do not know whether I shall be at home when P. U. comes, since at our conference there were requests for aid in baptism and communion for which I promised Brother P. Eby, the Lord willing, to go with him on the 5th of May. Later I received a letter which states that we are to go to Morrison's Cove,[1] 160 miles from here, where a congregation was established last year, when three of our ministers went out and ordained a preacher and a deacon and conducted communion service. Last fall Abraham Stauffer of Jacob's Creek,[2] where Jacob Neff at first lived, was with us on a visit. We insisted that he should go that way on his way home. He baptized 9 and held communion. Now they want baptism and communion again. I took the letter to P. Eby's congregation on Easter day, and gave him the letter to read. He said that the last place where we would have a meeting, Strassburg, 80 miles from here, would be on the 17th. On the 18th we would go across the mountains, and would have not quite 100 miles to the Cove. I said they wanted me to go along last year but I did not trust my old body for the journey. He said that he had also refused last year, but since the request came again he would not refuse. I asked him whether he was sure that my old body could stand crossing the three rocky ridges and valleys, where the inhabitants are scattered. He said yes; so although I had never in my life expected to see such country I could say nothing more. . . .

Hearty greetings from our whole house,

From your well wishing friend and brother,

Martin Möllinger.

XVIII

[A letter from Martin Mellinger to Charlotte Weber, widow, dated February 13, 1828 indicates that Johannes Weber had died in 1825, and that Mellinger's own wife died November 14, 1826.]

XIX

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
April 2, 1831

Dear Sister Charlotte Weber:

* * * * * *

I also want to tell you that at our conference a week ago yesterday, where 36 ministers and deacons were together, one of the ministers spoke to me about a request from the widow of the deceased Heinrich Rupp in regard to his inheritance.

[Further on in the same letter Mellinger tells about a Schumacher family which had come over in 1771, the mother being a sister to his mother, who were so poor that they had been unable to pay for the passage. Mellinger says that four of the children worked out their passage while the church paid for the passage of the father and mother out of the poor fund.]

---

[1] The congregation at Morrison's Cove, here mentioned as organized in 1824, is located at Martinsburg, Blair county, Pa.

[2] The Jacob's Creek congregation in Westmoreland County. It has since been called the Scottdale congregation. Abraham Stauffer was bishop there at this time.

XX

[A letter of Martin Mellinger to John Risser, Richland County, Mifflin Township, Mifflin P. O., Ohio, dated Jan. 3, 1833.

The letter is of slight importance, being filled with personalia. It mentions Peter Beutler, Jost Bally and Samuel Bally, as already having settled in this region. Jost Bally was later a prominent Mennonite bishop in Illinois.]

XXI

[A letter to Charlotte Weber dated April 15 1833.

Of slight importance, but mentions the conference of March 29, when preacher J. Risser and others lodged over night with him. Also mentions the fact that though he was 81 years of age, he was able to accompany three ministers on a two weeks tour of the churches.]

XXII

[A letter to Charlotte Weber dated January 6, 1835.

The letter is filled with personalia. It also mentions the fact that the railway from the Susquehanna to Philadelphia by way of Lancaster was now finished and that many accidents were reported.]

XXIII

Lampeter Township, Lancaster County,
June 18, 1839

Dear Cousin Jacob Weber:

I wish you and all those who are still among the living and inquire of me, a hearty good wish for temporal and eternal prosperity, and as a greeting the grace of God, the love of Jesus, and the accompanying power of the Holy Spirit.

I received your letter of April 18, 1839 from which I see that my dear sister, your dear mother, and dear Barbara Möllinger both passed through a lengthy sickness of the same sort and are no longer here below. And I trust that if we could ask them whether they would wish to come back to us again, they would say no. O, Blessed are those who can enter into the kingdom of joy! How we should all prepare ourselves diligently and live accordingly!

There is no one among you whom I can remember from that Easter day 67 years ago when I left except your mother-in-law and Agnes Möllinger, both of whom I shall never forget. I was glad to learn that your mother-in-law has not changed much in appearance . . . . So far as I know I am in my 87th year since last New Year, and am quite well. . . . Now I am the eldest in our congregation. . . .

In our house there are now really three families. I, a mother and two twin daughters, 14 years old, and our housekeeper, Ben Denlinger, his wife and son, a hired man and hired girl and W. Schuhmacher, and we all eat together, in the winter in the dining room, and in the summer in the summer kitchen, although each has his own things.

Dear cousin. At your request I have now in my old age told you much of temporal things, so that the letter is filled up. You have the Bible, where all men are invited to the great wedding feast of the Lord.

"Let he who will come, for today is the accepted day." You reported the departure of your mother, my dear sister, and dear cousin Möllinger. A little while and the same will be reported of me. It often seems to me that my sunset has come and that this will be my last letter to you and your friends. I trust that this may find you all well and walking in a peace pleasing to God. Greetings from our dear "grossmammi" and all of us to all who inquire of us, also from me to your brother Peter and his family.

May the God of peace prepare you and us for a blessed end and a joyful resurrection in and through Jesus Christ. Amen. Remember me as I remember you "im Guten."

So much in love from your cousin and friend who loves you all,

Martin Möllinger.

THE SURVEY

Research Notes

So much is being done in Anabaptist and Mennonite History that it seems not only worthwhile but necessary to undertake a systematic publication in the form of abstracts of at least such materials as will serve to promote the various research interests in this field. The *Research Notes* are designed to furnish data concerning progress in historical and sociological research together with such critical and explanatory remarks as the contributor may see fit to include. The material presented will cover all the phases of the social studies which have a direct or indirect bearing on the problems of Anabaptist and Mennonite history. (See also the Editorial in this issue for further announcement.) ERNST CORRELL.

Mennonitica

PAUL KOCH, *Der Einfluss des Calvinismus und des Mennonitentums auf die Niederrheinische Textilindustrie. Ein Beitrag zu Max Webers: "Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus."* Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde einer hohen staatswirtschaftlichen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München vorgelegt. Krefeld 1928. VII and 82 pp.

Although this doctoral dissertation had been prepared in Professor Jakob Strieder's excellent Seminar on Economic History, it does not quite live up to the standard set by that institute. Accustomed to its firm and well balanced productions, one is disappointed in looking for such qualities in Dr. Koch's study. He was, of course, not supposed to set out and write a faithful history of the various Mennonite settlements in the Lower Rhine territory. Yet in his attempt to argue with Max Weber's thesis on the influence of religio-ethical tenets on the "capitalist spirit" a careful record of the communities under discussion would have given an adequate basis for the discussion—much more so since there is no consolidated history of the Mennonites of the Lower Rhine in existence. A great deal of original research still needs to be done. Discussions in the Seminar of Professor Strieder were always fruitful in constructive criticism of the Max Weber thesis. It is to be hoped that renewed and more secure investigations of concrete cases will be made under his guidance to examine the alleged "protestant" influence on early modern capitalism.

The interesting feature of Dr. Koch's dissertation is a parallel

study on the development of the textile industry in Switzerland (pp. 49-66). Unfortunately, however, also in this direction his investigations were not prosecuted very diligently. In spite of this, the author comes to hasty conclusions in which he discounts religio-ethical influences on the capitalistic development of the textile industry. In Switzerland as well as along the Lower Rhine protestant refugees were active. It is on the refugee character, the mere fact of migration from technically higher developed countries, that the author lays emphasis. Werner Sombart as well as Max Weber and others referred to the same cause of the diffusion of technical knowledge. Important as this factor is, it by no means disposes of questions concerning the ethical predisposition of an early capitalistic outlook. In addition there was, so far as textile workers are concerned, an interesting observation made by Max Weber and previous writers on pietism often found in that trade. Dr. Koch fails to give any consideration to this. Even if granted that the "migration aspect" tells the story one is disappointed that so little has been done to clarify the Dutch connections in a satisfactory manner. This, it appears, is the proper way to approach the Lower Rhine textile history during the period of early capitalism as well as the history of the Krefeld and other Mennonite communities.

Gratifying is the bibliography, pp. II-VII. It outruns the scope of this dissertation and will be of value for further studies. (On page 22, note 2, reference is made to Müller, *Das Geschlecht Müller aus Gerolsheim* (no year, no place), a Swiss-Palatinate Mennonite family, members of which settled in Krefeld during the first half of the 18th century).

American University. ERNST CORRELL.

CHRISTOPHER DOCK

Christopher Dock, the now well known Mennonite school master of the colonial period, was the devoted Christian who wrote probably the earliest treatise on methods of teaching written and published in the colonies. His book, *Eine einfältige and gründlich abgefaszte Schulordnung,* was completed on August 8, 1750, though due to his extreme humility, it was not published until 1770.[1]

The work of Dock was first restored to the present generation

---

[1] S. W. Pennypacker, *Historical and Biographical Sketches,* pp. 94, 98.

through the research work of Samuel W. Pennypacker, LL. D., a former governor of Pennsylvania. Pennypacker, an ardent student of early Mennonite life, published in 1883, his *Historical and Biographical Sketches.*[2] An account of the life and work of Dock was included in this list of "sketches".

In 1908 a more complete *Life and Works of Christopher Dock,* was prepared by Martin G. Brumbaugh, Ph. D.,[3] who later also become governor of Pennsylvania. This book contains a biographical sketch of Dock together with a reprint of the German *Schulordnung* and of all other available writings of Dock.

An English translation of each is included. Chief among Dock's additional writings are his publications in the *Geistliches Magazien* of Christopher Saur. Magazine number 40, containing "A Hundred Necessary Rules of Conduct for Children,"[4] is probably as widely known as any.

Since the publication of these two noteworthy contributions to the history of education in America, no educational history of the colonial period is considered complete, until it at least briefly mentions the teaching and writing of this pious but unassuming Mennonite teacher of the Skippack.

The latest important notice of the work of Dock that has come to the attention of the writer, is a biographical summary of nearly 500 words found in the *Dictionary of American Biography.*[5] Here one finds a suggestive outline of the life of this formerly little known but earnest lover of children. Thomas Woody, Ph. D., Professor of Education in The University of Pennsylvania, the author of this last biographical account, is eminently qualified for this work, for he has given much of his time and energy to an evaluation of educational movements and trends in the early period of American educational history, particularly in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Goshen College. SILAS HERTZLER.

---

2 S. W. Pennypacker, *Historical and Biographical Sketches.* 1883. Philadelphia, Robert A. Tripple, pp. 89-153.

3 M. G. Brumbaugh, *The Life and Works of Christopher Dock.* 1908. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, pp. 1-272.

4 *Ibid,* pp. 167-174. Also pp. 202-213.

5 *Dictionary of American Biography,* Vol. V. pp. 337-338. 1930. New York, Charles Scribners Sons.

BOOK REVIEWS

The American Peace Crusade, 1815-1860. By MERLE EUGENE CURTI, Ph. D., Associate Professor of History, Smith College. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 1919. pp. x, 250.

It is commonly known that the period in history covered by Dr. Curti's book was rife with reform movements. These years mark some genuine achievement for the makers of democracy, the exponents of political liberty and social justice; they were great days for the anti-slavery crusader, the advocate of temperance, and the pioneer suffragette.

Another reform of considerable importance, but possibly not so well known was the effort for international peace. The author calls it a crusade and to be of any consequence, indeed, internationalism in the nineteenth century had to assume the crusading nature, for were not these the golden days of nationalism?

Regardless of the nationalistic tendencies of the age, however, Dr. Curti finds certain definite achievements to the credit of the peace crusade. It created well-established organizations with carefully planned policies which made for permanence; it established machinery and periodicals for publicity purposes; it developed a rich body of arguments against war which are characterized by positive development in practicability and realism; it formulated definite plans looking toward the establishment of international machinery; it accomplished international cooperation in its own activities; and it developed some remarkable leaders.

To be sure, as far as its ultimate objectives are concerned—influencing governments directly in the prevention of wars—the accomplishments were few enough. But considering the tremendous odds against which the crusaders worked they did possibly all that could reasonably be expected in the brief space of forty-five years.

The peace movement had its roots in eighteenth century humanitarianism and became active about 1815 as a reaction to the second war with Great Britain. Among the first names to appear on the scene was that of David Low Dodge, a merchant who wrote pamphlets contending that all war was contrary to the Christian religion, and who organized the New York Peace Society in 1815. A more prominent pioneer was the Reverend Noah Worcester who founded the Massachusetts Peace Society in the same year. The Quakers as a body, strangely enough, did not take any important part in this pioneer work although certain individuals did give it a degree of support.

The period from 1815 to 1828 was marked by the rise of numerous local societies, particularly in New England, but also in Ohio and as far west as Vigo County, Indiana and southward into North Carolina. During these years Noah Worcester was the outstanding figure. The next period, 1828-1841, was that of national organization

with William Ladd, founder of the American Peace Society, in the position of leadership. This society seemed to unify the local peace efforts and put the entire movement on a more solid footing.

Considering the general lack of interest in peace work and the natural odds against which Ladd and his associates labored, their accomplishments are really noteworthy. They worked through churches, seminaries and colleges. They induced ministers to pledge a peace sermon at least once a year; they broke into the religious press, which had generally been closed on the subject. They conducted prize essay contests and advocated the rewriting of American history books to promote the cause of peace. It seems that one such history was actually written for peace propaganda purposes. A pamphlet by Reverend Sylvester Judd entitled, *The Moral Evils of Our Revolutionary War,* was widely circulated by the American Peace Society and incidentally lost for the author his position as chaplain of the Maine state legislature. Possibly the greatest practical contribution was the development of the idea of a congress of nations. In 1832 Ladd himself published a pamphlet setting forth his ideas on the subject and in the ensuing years numerous memorials advocating such an international congress found their way to the national legislature, some of them bearing a thousand or more signatures. It was many years later than this that Ladd's hope was realized in part, first at the Hague and then at Geneva, but were he living to-day his disappointment would no doubt be great in the failure of his own nation thus far to become a full participant in this child of his dreams.

Even though this was a peace movement not all was peaceable within. Unfortunate as this may have been for the "cause," the dissension nevertheless concerned a rather vital issue: How far should pacifism be carried? Many leaders such as W. E. Channing, Noah Worcester, and George Beckwith were willing to condone "defensive wars." Others such as Thomas S. Grimké, William Lloyd Garrison, Elihu Burritt, and Henry C. Wright denounced all war as unchristian. William Ladd, although always moderate in his policies, seems to have been won over from the former position to the latter after finding "the inch he allowed brought in all the evils that a Bonaparte could desire. For even that instigator of wars suavely contended that they were all defensive!" As president of the American Peace Society, however, and as editor of the Society's official organ, he allowed both sides the privilege of expressing their views. The more extreme element finally withdrew and organized the New England Non-Resistance Society in 1838, which lived for more than a decade.

The American Peace Society continued its catholic policy of inviting the cooperation of men with all shades of opinion for the abolition of war. George Beckwith, who became president upon Ladd's death in 1841, held that the peace cause would be strengthened by admitting the greatest variety of argument and influence. His position was consistently challenged, however, by the "reformers" within the society, a group who wanted a clear testimony against all wars, including defensive ones, but who had not withdrawn with the non-resistants in 1838. Elihu Burritt was the chief spokesman of this group.

The decade of the forties witnessed a number of international problems which served to test the effectiveness of the peace crusades. There were the Mexican War and the boundary disputes with Great Britain. It is the conclusion of the author that few if any of the peaceable settlements made during this period can be ascribed directly to the work of the crusaders. Politicians, the church, and the public generally were too lukewarm toward their efforts. A rather notable exception among statesmen, however, was Charles Sumner, a member of the executive committee of the American Peace Society, who delivered a notable address in 1845 against the Mexican and Oregon crises. The peace workers themselves maintained their position quite consistently throughout the Mexican War although James Russell Lowell found occasion to satirize such individual pacifists as Emerson and Whitman who changed their colors when the war began.

From its very beginning the international character of the peace movement was emphasized to some extent. Plans for an international newspaper were discussed. Exchange visits between British and American peace workers were arranged, and in 1843 the first international congress of peace workers was held in London. This congress discussed methods of work and adopted resolutions favoring the principles of arbitration and condemned the British wars then being carried on in the East. "An address to the civilized governments of the world" was also drawn up and presented to fifty-four governments. The congress received considerable publicity and consequently the peace movement became known to a much wider public than ever before.

Among those who saw great possibilities for an international work was Elihu Burritt. Dissatisfied with the compromising policies of the American Peace Society, he founded in England in 1846 the League of Universal Brotherhood which soon had a large membership on both sides of the Atlantic. Members of the League were required to sign a pledge utterly renouncing participation in all kinds of warfare.[1] Burritt borrowed this idea from the temperance movement and used it with great effectiveness. He appealed to all classes of people, churches and laboring groups especially. The British anti-Corn Law League supported his work. The reform group of the

[1] The text of the pledge was as follows: "Believing all war to be inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and destructive to the best interests of mankind, I do hereby pledge myself never to enlist or enter into any army or navy, or to yield any voluntary support or sanction to the preparation for or prosecution of any war, by whomsoever, for whatsoever proposed, declared, or waged. And I do hereby associate myself with all persons, of whatever country, condition, or color, who have signed, or shall hereafter sign this pledge, in a 'League of Universal Brotherhood;' whose object shall be, to employ all legitimate and moral means for the abolition of all war, and all spirit, and all the manifestation of war, throughout the world; for the abolition of all restrictions upon international correspondence and friendly intercourse, and of whatever else tends to make enemies of nations, or prevents their fusion into one peaceful brotherhood; for the abolition of all institutions and customs which do not recognize the image of God and a human brother in every man of whatever clime, color, or condition of humanity."

American Peace Society stood solidly back of his efforts. Methodist Conferences urged the signature of the pledge. The League sent "friendly addresses" to the governments of Europe and contributed columns entitled "Olive Leaves" to the newspaper press. This seems to have been one of the most practical things done by the entire peace movement. The Olive Leaf mission was widespread in Europe. Burritt estimated that the leaves reached a million readers each month. They were effective enough to arouse some genuine opposition. At least one German newspaper was fined for printing an Olive Leaf which was too radical for the public officials.

The most ambitious work done by Burritt was the calling of four international peace congresses—at Brussels, 1848; Paris, 1849; Frankfort, 1850; and London, 1851. These congresses added to the dignity and prestige of the movement and served to register a definite protest against the militarism of the mid-century. In the opinion of the author they represent "the greatest single accomplishment" of the peace movement of this period.

Among the objectives of the peace movement was the adoption of arbitration as a fixed policy by the various governments. Each of the peace congresses urged that a clause requiring arbitration be written into all international agreements. During the forties and fifties great pressure was brought to bear on the governments of England and the United States to adopt such a policy. Both congress and parliament were presented with petitions and memorials in large numbers. And then in 1849 Richard Cobden actually presented in the House of Commons a motion to adopt a resolution for the arbitration of all disputes. As was to be expected, the proposal was lost, but the friends of the motion were able to muster 79 votes against 176 for the opposition. No doubt the pacifists found some consolation in the Anglo-American claims convention of 1853 which embodied the principle of arbitration, although this did not involve any commitment to arbitration in the future.

The decade of the fifties witnessed the Crimean War in Europe and brought America to the threshold of the Civil War. These were trying years for the peace movement which now began to wane, and that for several reasons. The old leaders were rapidly passing away and the movement had failed to build up its ranks with a sufficient number of young men. Possibly the large number of reforms in progress tended to scatter too greatly the interest of crusading spirits. The anti-slavery cause in particular secured scores of recruits which the peace movement might otherwise have secured. And then wars were in the air. "The Crimean War, the Far Eastern catastrophes and the wars of Italian liberation took much wind from the sails of peace men everywhere." By 1860 the movement had so weakened that the annual business meeting of the American Peace Society of that year failed to muster a quorum for the first time in its history. The annual report of this year is none too optimistic and admits that the "entire permanent cure of war may prove the work of all future time, a reform to end only with the end of the world itself."

This pessimistic report clearly indicates a temporary decline in the peace crusade but it was by no means the death knell. The

American Peace Society lived to celebrate its centennial anniversary in 1928. In the period since the Civil War and particularly since the World War scores of additional peace organizations have sprung up to carry on the crusade on an increasingly large scale. Students of American social history and of international relations owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Curti for his careful and accurate study of the peace crusade from 1815 to 1860 and will look forward with anticipation to his study of the period following 1860 which is now in preparation.

Most books are characterized by elements of weakness as well as strength. In this case the chief weakness lies in the style and presentation. The reader misses those qualities of language which enable the story to move along smoothly and freely. The style is somewhat heavy. The transitions of thought are frequently not clear making it necessary for the reader to retrace his steps in order to know definitely where he is going. A tendency to needless repetition in explaining a point sometimes leads the reader along a train of thought that ends in a blind alley. These are merely tendencies, however, and not sufficiently serious to injure greatly the value of the book.

Mennonites have adhered to the principles of peace for 400 years. Yet, in reading Mr. Curti's book they will discover—and possibly without surprise—that the word "Mennonite" can not be found anywhere between its covers. The explanation is, of course, that Mennonites have in the past been pacifists or non-resistants, but they have not been peace crusaders. And tendencies for cooperation with other groups in any kind of work has been conspicuously lacking. Like the Quakers in the earlier period, only much more so, they could develop little enthusiasm for a peace movement which savored of anything short of absolute non-resistance. Then too, the idea of social service, except within their own group, was so foreign to the thinking of Mennonites before the Civil War that participation in the peace crusade was quite impossible. This attitude still exists to some extent, of course, but it has been considerably modified during the last half century. Consequently, Mr. Curti, in writing his new book on the peace movement to date will no doubt find occasion to mention the Mennonites—at least in the footnotes.

Goshen College. Guy F. Hershberger.

"Hey! Yellowbacks!" The War Diary of a Conscientious Objector. By Ernest L. Meyer. Foreword by William Ellery Leonard. New York: The John Day Company. 1930. pp. x, 209.

This book contains the memoirs of a University of Wisconsin undergraduate who was inducted into the United States army against his will in 1918 and endured the experiences of a political war objector for a period of four months or longer. The blazoned narrative begins with Mr. Meyer's expulsion from the university (not to be reinstated until ten years later) for his anti-war views and takes the reader through the discipline of Camps Taylor and Sherman, Fort Leavenworth, and Fort Riley.

For a study of the tyranny and depressive influence of militarism the book is worthwhile if critically used. Its two hundred odd pages

of rhetorical exuberance are an aid to the understanding of wartime psychology. Possibly their greatest service, however, is a concrete demonstration of the working of a cynical mind. But if the reader is looking for an unimpassioned, accurate and critical study of the conscientious objector and his conflict with the military he will need to seek elsewhere. It is not to be found in this book.

T. H. Thomas in a recent review[1] may not be entirely just when he suggests "Disappointed objector" as a suitable subtitle, and characterizes the book as an "effort to parade an attitude," inspired by egotism. And yet the author is so cocksure of the correctness of his own views that they are certainly not presented with modesty. Furthermore the bestiality of the military and the stupidity of the religious objector are assumed so dogmatically that all possibility of sympathetic study and careful analysis is excluded. The result is an agglomeration of truth, inaccuracy, exaggeration, and caricature.

But one must be charitable. The undergraduate has generally not learned to be critical, and the hysterical days of 1918 did little to encourage coolness and deliberation. To be placed, under these circumstances, into a foreign environment, with one element aggressively hostile and the other according to his natural tastes, is a test for any man. The author confesses his loneliness. "I can speak neither the tongue of the Crusaders nor the jargon of the military men." (p. 90).

Many of Mr. Meyer's reflections, moreover, are characterized by a degree of candor and common sense which demand respect and admiration. Witness this frank confession to an army captain:

> I can't believe that the allies have come into this with clean hands, or that a new era of international peace and justice will follow our victory . . . I think war as an instrument has been discredited again and again, and I can't bring myself to commit murder in its name. . . . I love my country, but there is a patriotism that extends beyond national boundaries. I can feel no hatred for another nation or race merely because a group of war-makers sign an official paper. (pp. 41-42).

Or this one in his defense before Dean Stone of the board of inquiry:

> They [peaceable methods of settling disputes] were not tried with the same vigor, the same sacrifice that we have mobilized in the war. If the same amount of energy, money, organization and labor had been expended in securing a crystallization of the peace sentiment among the nations nothing could have resisted it. (p. 94).

These paragraphs, however, represent the best portions of the book. They are a candid expression of the author's own convictions. But when he deals with others the result is not so fortunate. As an illustration take the treatment of the Mennonites who comprised by far the largest group of conscientious objectors. The author's attitude is summed up succinctly by Mr. Leonard in the foreword, as follows: They are "so asocial, so grotesque in ideas, customs, even dress, as to be worse than useless . . . making, in the popular mind, the war objector a lunatic or a comic strip, even more than a traitor or cow-

1 *The Journal of Modern History* (Dec., 1930), Vol. II, p. 636.

ard" (p. vi). By this he means, of course, that they are odd and peculiar, that they are ignorant and stupid, unacquainted with the world about them, quite unable to make any contribution to society. In support of this view the author paints a lurid picture of a "typical" Mennonite, bearded, dressed in funereal black, high crowned hat, trousers without pockets, held together with hooks and eyes, who believes razors and buttons unlawful because "it is not set down in the Bible that men should shave or wear buttons." (p. 66). They are dull. "They suffer much from their persecutors, but they endure more under the rigorous discipline of their own faith." "They sing and pray eternally." This is their only pastime. Their theological discussions are ludicrous. They prove by the Scriptures that no man can be exactly six feet tall because only the Lord God is of this measure!

The best way to answer such nonsense would be to ignore it, were it not that some will take it seriously. A certain lack of social-mindedness on the part of the Mennonites may be granted, and no doubt some are ignorant. But certainly Mr. Meyer's lurid picture is quite unfair. He says he inquired concerning their history, but evidently he failed to discover that his "typical" bearded Mennonite represents only seven or eight per cent of the total number of Mennonites in America. Many of Mr. Meyer's co-inhabitants in the conscientious objector camp were farmers and not all had gone to college. It is unlikely therefore that the knowledge of affairs possessed by some was not always so profound as his. But the reviewer recalls reading a statement that the army tests proved the objectors to be of higher average intelligence than the regular army. Possibly the margin was due to the few scattered intellectuals in the group; but even then the remainder should be conceded as at least of average intelligence.

The "stupid" Mennonite who furnished Meyer his historical and statistical data hailed from Elkhart County, Indiana. Evidently he did not convey the information that the Mennonites hold teaching positions in the public schools, rural and city, of that county, in numbers considerably beyond their proportion of the total population. Possibly he also failed to mention that this same county is the home of a Mennonite college, a number of whose graduates and undergraduates were conscientious objectors during the war. And in spite of their stupidity they have done fairly well since. One has gradually risen to a position in the information section of the secretariat of the League of Nations and has become sufficiently socially minded to draw the fire of the American jingo press for placing his allegiance to the League above allegiance to his own nation. A number of others have risen to important teaching positions on university faculties. This does not seem such a mean accomplishment, especially after Mr. Leonard tells us that all of his political objector acquaintances have had their careers thwarted by the war: "A brilliant university instructor of philosophy turned obscure editor of a labor journal; another, a research zoologist, selling dye-stuffs on the road." (p. vi).

Meyer's book leaves the impression that the religious objectors (except possibly a few Quakers) at Sherman, Taylor and Riley were all untutored. The reviewer was not among them but happens to

know personally three college-trained men in the group at Riley. One was a Dunkard with a graduate degree from the University of Pennsylvania, now professor of classical literature in a college in Kansas, and a debate coach of state-wide reputation for success, training men to debate social and political questions. Can this be the same Dunkard to whom Meyer refers as unable to share in his appreciation of Aristophanes? (p. 182).

The author of the diary also finds fault with the Mennonites for leaving "no visible imprint on our military civilization through the four centuries of their existence." (p. 67). This is hardly a fair challenge. Their history began in the sixteenth century at a time when their principles (including such advanced ideas as the separation of church and state, religious freedom, and non-resistance) were condemned by society as the rankest heresy. As a result they developed a tendency to withdraw from society, the world, and public life—a tendency which has not yet been entirely overcome. This isolationist method of propagating peace may not have been the most effective, but what has been accomplished by Mr. Meyer's friends, the intellectuals and the social radicals? He admits that in 1907 Karl Marx officially went to war, that socialism "in the final test . . . collapsed" as an instrument "to further the brotherhood of man." (p. 163). In 1918 Marxism was seventy years old but not yet able to meet the personal test, let alone counteracting effectively the militarism of our day! But is Mr. Meyer aware that Mennonitism (Anabaptism) was not ten years old until 5,000 had met the test even unto martyrdom? And in 1918, after four centuries, they still composed the majority of those who did not officially participate in war. It is true that they have not displayed as much "clear thinking on statecraft, economics, internationalism, humanity" as they should, and it is to be hoped they will learn to do better. But on the other hand it might be worth while for others to take note of their tenacious adherence to principle even under test.

The contribution of the Mennonites to civilization has possibly not been great. And yet a study of their history would no doubt reveal a few surprises to the author of the war diary. He refers to them as good farmers. But does he know that practically all progress in scientific agricultural methods and in stock breeding in the Rhine valley in the eighteenth century was the work of the Swiss Mennonites? Theirs were the first great model farms, praised by the early writers on agriculture and visited by agricultural reformers of all European countries, including England. Moreover, it was David Mellinger, a Mennonite farmer of south Germany, who first introduced scientific crop rotation and the use of clover for rebuilding soils into modern agriculture.[2]

The Dutch Mennonites were industrialists, bankers, and shipowners and it was not a small role which they played in the commercial development of Holland in the seventeenth century. Their contribution to the manufacture of silk is especially noteworthy. As

[2] For a discussion of the subject see Correll, Ernst, *Das Schweizerische Täufer-Mennonitentum*, Munich, 1925.

colonizers the Mennonites have been important for four hundred years.

It is possibly true that the more recent contribution of the Mennonites to civilization is not so important as that of the past; and possibly the European Mennonites have a better record than the Americans. But concerning the American Mennonites a few facts might well be pointed out. The first book on pedagogy printed in America was written by Christopher Dock, a Mennonite school master. Thomas Woody writing on Dock in the *Dictionary of American Biography* says, "The fame of the pious school-master rests not wholly upon the early date of his publication . . . but upon the modernity of much of his practice." The book passed through two editions in 1770.

It was the Mennonites who made the first formal protest against slavery in America (Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1688). The first paper manufacturer in America was a Mennonite (William Rittenhouse, 1693). Until recently, Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, the most densely settled Mennonite community in America was also the wealthiest agricultural county in the United States. It was a Mennonite college (Goshen) that founded the present nation-wide intercollegiate peace oratorical contest. A little investigation might reveal the surprising fact that Mennonites hold their full share of positions on American university faculties in proportion to their population. Offhand the reviewer would be able to name two at Harvard, one at Yale, one at Michigan, one at Pennsylvania, one at Ohio State, several in Pennsylvania state normal schools, and numerous others.

With all his misstatements and misinterpretations, however, Mr. Meyer deserves credit for frequent expressions of a commendable, unselfish attitude.

> I can understand the hatred of the administration for the "reds," whose political heresy may in some future generation spell the doom of the soldier as a uniformed servant of capitalism, and I can almost forgive the brutality as a measure of self-defense and retaliation. But I can't forgive the treatment of the religious objectors who are serving God according to their lights in a nation that proclaims itself Christian and a protector of religious freedom." (pp. 166-67).

And possibly even the misinterpretation and the caricature is accounted for in the following confession:

> The major quoted rules and regulations, set down in black and white; the religious Crusaders consulted some still, small voice within them, powerful for all its vagueness; the radicals were fortified by class-consciousness and hatred of our imperialistic exploiters; the humanitarians were strengthened by love—and all these queer souls, soldier, political heretic and saint, would have gone, and will go, perhaps, to their death rather than yield an inch of their ground. (pp. 158-59).

Such fervid devotion to a cause, however admirable, often makes for blurred vision and warped judgment. What religious objector is ready to put his memoirs into print? When he does so will he deal more fairly with the political radical than Meyer has treated the religionist? Occasional references to the subject by Mennonites cause one to be skeptical. And yet it seems that this principle of fairness

is quite essential to a true understanding of the movement against war at the present time.

Goshen College. Guy F. Hershberger.

The Hutterian Brethren, 1528-1928: *A Story of Martyrdom and Loyalty.* By JOHN HORSCH. Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, No. 2. Published by the Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana. 1931.*

The series, *Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History,* presents John Horsch's "Hutterian Brethren" as its first treatment of an Anabaptist group proper. No other section of the movement represents so faithfully to this present day its original life and program. No other body has so fully preserved to the present the spirit of the Reformation Period. It has even created a living modern replica of the life of that long ago day in the new Hutterian community recently established near Neuhof (Fulda), in Hessen-Nassau, Germany.

Aside from this living spirit to which John Horsch's account of the Hutterites testifies, this number of the *Studies* throws light in concrete fashion on the economic and social aspects of original Anabaptism. This is true in spite of the fact that the work appears as a contribution to church history and not as an economic and social study. Bertha W. Clark in the University of Chicago *Journal of Political Economy* (1924) has described the modern Hutterian Brotherhood from this latter point of view, as the German economist Robert Liefmann of the University of Freiburg had previously done in the *Jahrbücher für Nationaloekonomie und Statistik* (1908). Both in a striking way come to the conclusion that their religious faith has been the determining factor in the life of the group. Those who have had the opportunity to study first-hand the documentary sources of the Hutterites and of other Anabaptist communities or have come into personal touch with them will not be surprised at such conclusions. In the face of recent American publications on the so-called "social origins" of religious denominations, it might be of value to suggest that the Hutterian phenomenon past and present should be investigated as a test case by those who proclaim with such assurance that economic determinism has shaped religious organizations. A thorough study of this sort might at least result in the observation that neither religion nor "history," as such, permit such simplified interpretations.

A diligent reconstruction of the economic and social organization of the first Hutterian century—approximately the period of original settlement in Bohemia—would also furnish valuable data on various problems in economic history. It is doubtful whether equally valuable data of such a fresh nature could be as readily collected elsewhere.

When the Hutterian communities were first established, money

* This is an advance notice of John Horsch's book. It is a reproduction of the *Foreword* by Dr. Ernst Correll, American University, Washington, D. C.

economy of a crude type was being expanded. At the same time price economy in general was becoming more intensified in such a way as to revolutionize traditional socio-economic relationships. Apparently, the Hutterian Brethren succeeded in continuing and improving within their non-pecuniary households the economic achievements of their age. There are numerous extant sources such as those referred to by our author in pages 17f, 116ff, and passim, which describe the skill and generally acknowledged success of the Brethren. Professor Johann Loserth of the University of Graz in Austria, in many of his articles in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* and Dr. Robert Friedmann of Vienna, in *Der Wiener Zeitschrift Fuer Volkskunde* and the *Archiv Fuer Reformationsgeschichte,* point to extensive archival sources where detailed information can be secured. Of particular interest are the "Regulations" which were issued by the managers of the "households." These regulations governed the technical processes used in Hutterite industry and prescribed the standard of excellence for the products of the astonishingly great number of trades conducted by the Hutterites. These Anabaptist refugees from the various countries of Western Europe who established their communistic settlement in Bohemia, naturally pooled the technical experiences which they had accumulated. Thus they created an extraordinary type of workmanship which the policy of mercantilistic princes everywhere, centuries later, tried to attain by summoning experts from foreign lands. The care which the Hutterites took in educating their youth, apparently with a view to their vocational training, is another amazing feature of their conscious endeavor to maintain progressive standards in spite of an environment far below the general level of their achievements. Among modern educators, Professor Frederick Eby, of the University of Texas, has recognized, and is studying, the unique position of the Hutterian school system in the history of education.

It is clear that a definite rational attitude governed the "worldly" activities of the Hutterian communities. Their industrial organization does not smack of medieval guild traditionalism with its tendency to guarantee a certain satisfactory status for life and work. There seems to be no cultivation of personal pride in individual "master" achievements. Yet the economic record of the entire group represents a high degree of efficiency much like that which emanates from the production statistics of a prosperous modern industrial plant. The Hutterian "households" in their group activity as well as in the activities of members who were functioning as stewards, millers, building contractors, etc., in the service of feudal lords, furnish remarkable examples of the possibilities of a slightly developed technical age under the urge of religious discipline. Max Weber in his search for examples of "protestant" influences in the development of modern capitalistic industry could have found an "ideal type" among these communistic Hutterites, who in their sober "worldly" labors were intent only on serving God and "working out" their soul's salvation.

The use of money by Hutterian groups is another indication of rational methods. While pecuniary relationships were eliminated

within the "households," the money income from sales of their products and from outside services was deposited with the "manager." He was the purchasing agent and the procurer of raw material. The suspicion that the Hutterites were hoarding treasures, to which Horsch refers, pages 117f, reveals upon further investigation that a "capital reserve" was carefully built up in order to protect the group in case of losses through persecution, war, and general depression. It becomes evident that this communistic group naturally developed a financial policy which at that time was rarely conceived in public finance and administration.

To the economic historian the Hutterite Community during its first century presents a rare mirror of the economic world of that time. The communistic system which they endeavored to build and maintain on a high ethical level serves to emphasize the characteristic economic activities and technical organizations of their day. Furthermore their principle of nonresistance brought about a noble social relationship within the comparatively large group which they represented, which was undefiled by political strife and desire for conquest. This again serves to clarify the understanding of their character as "economic men" without competitive interests. Temptations to individualistic acquisitive attitudes were checked or frustrated by religious devotion and strict discipline.

Finally, the sociologist will take notice of the type of social organization cultivated by the Hutterites. Theirs is the most effective solution of religious communism, the ideal form of "separation from the World." The "communism" of the early church, as recorded in Acts 2, which is so often misunderstood, was a communism of consumption only. The Hutterian Brethren went further. On a higher technical and economic level than primitive Christianity could possibly have operated, they succeeded in establishing a communistic organization of production and consumption under the command and discipline of Christian love and the spirit of their Master. It was a communism, however, which did not mean economic indifference because of its religious fervor, or a purely self-sufficient economy on a reduced standard of living, or the realization of the ideal of the holy poor life of monastic ascetism. As a matter of fact, the Hutterian communities constantly produced a surplus for "foreign" markets and in addition had members hired out to the "world" outside. They "exported" both goods and services. Socially the Hutterian "households" with their many families, each formed a "body politic," providing for the needs of their members under the guidance of religious principles of education, management of producton, consumption, trade and social welfare, including medical care and protecton of the aged.

No Utopia, not a chiliastic flare, but the positive *Civitas Dei* of Anabaptism on the basis of a Christian *communis omnium possessio*—this is the Hutterian Brotherhood whose story John Horsch records.

American University, Washington, D. C. Ernst Correll.

Fifty Bible Stories. By ELLA ZOOK. Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House. 1929. Illustrated. pp. 196.

The stories are retold for children, twenty-five from the Old Testament, twenty-five from the New. The book gives evidence of considerable industry and of a genuine love for Bible stories and for children. While it is written and published in an attempt to fill a real gap among Mennonite publications and will no doubt fill a place in Mennonite homes, it is to be regretted that the volume leaves so much to be desired in style and language. Because its prose belongs to a period that is past, the usefulness of the work is unnecessarily abridged.

Goshen College. John Umble.

True Life Stories. By OSCAR BURKHOLDER (minister). Breslau, Ontario. Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House. 1929. pp. 78.

"The stories are select ones that have appeared in the *Youth's Christian Companion* during the past three years." Although they are written with little regard for the technical niceties of literary style, these stories are "true," not only in fact, but also in their fine sincerity and in their faithful adherence to the older Mennonite tradition of deep religious piety.

Goshen College. John Umble.